Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans

Walking Route Audit Tool

Overview

The primary function of the Walking Route Audit Tool (WRAT) is to assess the current condition and suitability of a walking route. The WRAT is intended to be used during or following a site visit and provides a means of ensuring that all of the factors are considered.

Walking Route Audit Tool Criteria

The WRAT uses a range of criteria to assess how well a route meets the core design outcomes, with scoring ranging from 2, being the highest, to 0, being the lowest.

The criteria are:

- attractiveness
- comfort
- directness
- safety
- coherence

How to use the RST

The WRAT requires the auditor to score the route against the following criteria:

0 for poor provision (RED)

1 for provision which is adequate but should be improved if possible (AMBER)

2 for good quality provision (GREEN)

A score of 70% (i.e. a score of 28 out of a potential 40 points) should normally be regarded as a minimum level of provision overall. Routes which score less than this, and factors which are scored as zero should be used to identify where improvements are required. As the scoring is sometimes qualitative the tool also allows the auditor to add comments explaining their score allocation. The actions column allows auditors to record solutions to any of the issues identified on the route e.g. removing redundant street clutter to improve its attractiveness.

Summary

General information regarding the route can be entered at the bottom of the tool.

Further Information

LCWIP Guidance (Annex C) provides further information about the WRAT.

Acknowledgement

The WRAT was developed by Local Transport Projects Ltd. as part of the Active Travel Wales Guidance.

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. 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		
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		
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	1		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss	sues include:		1	Mature trees in the verge.	
- other	 Evidence that lighting is not presen Temporary features affecting the at Excessive use of guardrail or bollar 	tractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sac	eks).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
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 pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	1	There is damage to the footway surface at a number of the mature trees where roots have pushed up flags/setts.	Repair tree root damage where required.
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		
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.	2		
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		
9. COMFORT	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in	2		
- gradient		exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	12).			
10.COMFORT - other	Barriers/gates restricting access; arBus shelters restricting clearance w	clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. c nd		1	Bus shelter causes a pinch point and there are bollards.	
COMFORT				10		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g.	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in	adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2		
relation to 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).	1		
- 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.	1	The one signal controlled crossing point at the corner of St John Street is two stage with an Island that lacks capacity for peak usage.	Alter the signals to operate as a single phase.
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.	1	Green time is sufficient for each of the crossing stages but not for the whole	
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.		1			
DIRECTNESS				8		
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.	1		
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.	1		
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.	1	Mature trees restrict visibility.	
SAFETY collisions.			3			
SAFETY						
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile	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		
20. COHERENCE		provided, albeit not to current		2		

Total Score

Route Name	The Friary
Length	390
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	8
Safety	3
Coherence	2
Total	29

Comments	
Actions	

	,	
Walking	Route Audit Tool	

FLATING PRINCIPLES Control of the control of th	Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
2. ATTRACTIVENESS The rest of crime is a common to make the make the control of t			vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling	Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street	2		
- traffic notes and ATTRACTIVENESS - Souther an interference interest of a transition of the temporal management of the attractive control of the at			Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including	2		
College of the Control of the Con					2		
ACMIFORT - CONFORT - CONFO		Evidence that lighting is not present,Temporary features affecting the attr	or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sack	s).		parking. Traffic flows are very	
condition condition, with ro or phases. condition received and with received and with received and with roughly proposed and received and with received and w	ATTRACTIVENESS	· ·			6		
## distory or ward claws between sense of selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws and sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between sense or selecting or leads. ## distory or ward claws between s			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	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant	2		
**width on staggered crossings in product from the between particular production stage of the common stage		without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess	approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take'	(i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in	2	wide and observation suggests that the whole raid is	
Cookeay parking Cookeay protect. Clearance within Cookean	- width on staggered crossings/	without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to	1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and	standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads	2		
- gradient - Othor - O		footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m 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	Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from	2		
Examples of other comfort issues include:		There are no slopes on footway.			2		
11.DIRECTNESS Footway rovision Footway provision could be pedestrian desire lines Footway provision Footway provision	10.COMFORT	 Temporary obstructions restricting cl Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance with 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri d dth.				
podestrian desire lines (a.g. adjacent improved to better cater for road). 12.DIRECTNESS Include the controlled crossings in traffic (where no controlled crossings and without delay (< 55 average). 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered man time 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered man time 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered man time 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered man time 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to cross confortably. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered man time 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and powers to the controlled cross ingulated and without delay (< 56 average). 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to journey time. 15. DIRECTNESS Ingered crossings and displicantly to	COMFORT				10		
12.DIRECTNESS -		pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	improved to better cater for		2		
gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings are staggered but do not 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not 2 superior of thickly to wait so not 10s average). Crossings are staggered but do not 2 superior of thickly to wait so not 2 superior of the controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16. DIRECTNESS - other - Country of the common time 17. Aperty - Consulting access for all users: - Other 18. SAFETY - traffic volume - traffic volume - traffic volumes 18. SAFETY - Traffic speed solw, or pedestrians are attaggered but do not 2 superior of the common time and 2 superior of the common time but current value for second or all users: - Coordiving layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users - Traffic volume with pedestrians or pedestrians in close proximity Traffic volume with pedestrians are and pedestrians in close proximity Traffic volumes 18. SAFETY - Traffic volumes - Traf	- location of crossings in		Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	0 ,	2	there is no need to provide	
14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings are single phase pelicar/puffin or zebra crossings. 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16. DIRECTNESS - green man time 17. DIRECTNESS - cother 18. DIRECTNESS - cother 18. DIRECTNESS - cother 18. DIRECTNESS - diverse included green man time but current imme unlikely to deter users. 18. DIRECTNESS - cother 19. DIRECTNES	- gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled	comfortable and without delay (< 5s	associated with some delay (up to	or associated with significant delay	2		
- green man time 10 cross comfortably. extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	- impact of controlled		add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in	2		
- other	- green man time	to cross comfortably.	extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	vulnerable users sufficient time to	2		
17.SAFETY Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. 18.SAFETY Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. 18.SAFETY Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. 19.SAFETY Good visibility for all users. 19.SAFETY Sisibility Could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions. 19.COHERENCE Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision. 10.COHERENCE Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current standards. 17.Taffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. 18.Igh traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. 19.COHERENCE Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision. 20.COHERENCE Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current standards. 21.Taffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. 18.Igh traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. 19.COHERENCE Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provisions. 22.Tactile paving is not used along what is essentially an extension of the pedestrianised central area. 23.Tactile paving is not used along what is essentially an extension of the pedestrianised central area.		Routes to/from bus stops not accomSteps restricting access for all users	s not accommodated; for all users;				
- traffic volume Can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Pedestrians in close proximity. Unable to keep their distance from traffic	DIRECTNESS				10		
- traffic speed can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. 19.SAFETY - visibility Good visibility for all users. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions. Visibility collisions. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions. 2 2 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving provision. Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current standards. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect. 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current standards. 2 Tactile paving is not used along what is essentially an extension of the pedestrianised central area. COHERENCE		can keep distance from moderate		unable to keep their distance from	2		
19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving provision. Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provision. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provision. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current standards. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect. 2 Tactile paving is not used along what is essentially an extension of the pedestrianised central area. COHERENCE COHERENCE 2 Tactile paving is not used along what is essentially an extension of the pedestrianised central area.		can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.		unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2		
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving 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 Tactile paving is not used along what is essentially an extension of the pedestrianised central area. 2 COHERENCE	- visibility		improved but unlikely to result in	Poor visibility, likely to result in	2		
- dropped kerbs and tactile paving provision. provided, albeit not to current standards. provided, albeit not to current standards. absent or incorrect. along what is essentially an extension of the pedestrianised central area.	SAFETY				6		
	- dropped kerbs and tactile		provided, albeit not to current		2	along what is essentially an extension of the	
Total Score 24	COHERENCE				2		
Total Score 34				Total Score	34		

Route Name	
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	34

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	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).		1	A section of a neibouring property wall had fallen onto the footway.	
. 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		
. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and	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	1		
. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not present - Temporary features affecting the att - Excessive use of guardrail or bollare	, or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sack	s).			
TTRACTIVENESS	-			4		
. 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.	1	Some defects at the transition between the pedestrian area and the older street scape.	
. 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		
. 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.	2	There are no formal crossing points.	
. 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.	1	During the audit a large delivery van was parked across the road.	
. 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		
0.COMFORT other	Barriers/gates restricting access; anBus shelters restricting clearance wi	g clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); and				
COMFORT				8		
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	1	The dropped kerds at the Stanford Road crossing closest to Swan Road are set back from the desire line.	
3.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		
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.	1	Only at the Swan Road end.	
5. DIRECTNESS green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	1	as above.	
6.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	nmodated; ;;				
DIRECTNESS				7		
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		
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.	1		
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.	2		
AFETY		Journal Office		5		
0. COHERENCE dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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.	1		
COHERENCE				1		
			T-4-10	0.5		

Total Score

25

Route Name	Sandford Street
Length	150
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	8
Directness	7
Safety	5
Coherence	1
Total	25

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	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		
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		
s. 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		
I. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not present - Temporary features affecting the att - Excessive use of guardrail or bollar	t, or is deficient; tractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sac	ks).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
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 pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
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.	1	Variable footpath widths, in places as little as 1 metre.	
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.	1	There is no footway on one side of the road (adjacent to the Cathedral).	
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 on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
). 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).	1	There is a ramp structure constructed for disabled access into one of the listed properties adjacent to the Cathedral. This takes the whole width of the footway.	
IO.COMFORT other	Barriers/gates restricting access; arBus shelters restricting clearance w	clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. d nd				
COMFORT				7		
1.DIRECTNESS	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g.	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2	The close is very lightly trafficked. Crossing is straight	
footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in	adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	Pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2	forward.	
relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings oresent or if likely to cross outside of controlled	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) 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		
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.	2		
6.DIRECTNESS other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
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.	2		
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.	2		
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		
SAFETY				6		
20. COHERENCE dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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.	1	Tactile paving has not been provided in historic heritage area.	
COHERENCE				1		
JOHE KENDE			Total Score	30		

Route Name	The Close
Length	232
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	7
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	1
Total	30

Comments	
Actions	

Walking	Route	Δudit	Tool
waikiiig	Noute	Auuit	1001

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no	Minor littering. Overgrown	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent.	2		
- 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.			
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		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attractive use of guardrail or bollard	or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sack	s).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
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 pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
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		
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.	2		
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		
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		
10.COMFORT - other	Barriers/gates restricting access; anBus shelters restricting clearance wi	ary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); s/gates restricting access; and				
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		
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		
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		
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		
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		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
DIRECTNESS				10		
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		
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.	2		
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		
SAFETY				6		
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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		
COHERENCE				2		
			Total Score	34		

Route Name	Dam Street
Length	90 metres
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	34

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. 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		
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).	numiture failing into major disrepair. Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attr - Excessive use of guardrail or bollard:	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
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 pawment, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
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		
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.	2		
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		
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		
10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers'gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance width. - Poorty drained footways resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces				Advertising A boards cause an obstruction during times of heavy pedestrian flow.	
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		
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.		Low vehicle flows. No need for formal crossing points.	
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		
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		
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		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: - Routes toffrom bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
DIRECTNESS				10		
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		
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.	2		
19.SAFETY	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				6		
- visibility SAFETY						
SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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	No tactile paving in this virtually pedestrian environment.	
SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and		provided, albeit not to current		2	virtually pedestrian	

A.	
Route Name	Tamworth Street
Length	225
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2018

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	34

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. 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		
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		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attr - Excessive use of guardrail or bollard:	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
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 pawment, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
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		
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.	2		
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		
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		
10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers/gates restricting clearance width Bus shelters restricting clearance width Poorly drained footways resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces					
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		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled	Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2		
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		
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		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of other directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
DIRECTNESS				10		
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		
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.	2		
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		
SAFETY				6		
20. COHERENCE	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision.	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect.	2		
- dropped kerbs and tactile paving	paring provision.	standards.				
- dropped kerbs and	paring provider.			2		

Route Name	Market Street
Length	220 metres
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	34

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. 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		
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		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attr - Excessive use of guardrail or bollard:	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
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 pawment, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
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		
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.	2		
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		
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		
10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers/gates restricting clearance width Bus shelters restricting clearance width Poorly drained footways resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces					
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		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled	Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2		
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		
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		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of other directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
DIRECTNESS				10		
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		
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.	2		
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		
SAFETY				6		
20. COHERENCE	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision.	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect.	2		
- dropped kerbs and tactile paving	paring provision.	standards.				
- dropped kerbs and	paring provider.			2		

a.	
Route Name	M Pool Walk
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	34

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. 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		
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		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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	0		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issi - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the att - Excessive use of guardrail or bollard	or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sack	s).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				4		
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 of fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	1	Some uneven sections of footway adjacet to the development site opposite the station.	Ensure footway is improved when the site is developed.
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	Footway widths are greater than 2 metres.	
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.	2		
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		
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).	1	crossings.	
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; an Bus shelters restricting clearance wi 	learance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri d			Side road crossing distances are long at some junctions.ie, the bus station (approx 13 metres).	
COMFORT				8		
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		
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.	1		
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).	1	Gaps in the traffic due to signal control at both ends of this route section create crossing opportunities.	
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.	0	The signal controlled junction near to the station has no pedestrian crossing facilities.	Alter the junction to include pedestrian crossing facilities.
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.	0	A 20 second wait was recorded at the station pedestrian crossing. The crossing time was approx 5 seconds. Appropriate for the able bodied but not for vulnerable users. Debenhams Pedestrian crossing - a 25 second wait was recorded with an approx 8 second crossing time.	Provide longer crossing times at both crossing points to accommodate vulnerable users.
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of other directness issues include: - Routes tofrom bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.			New Rotten Row junction. All arms are staggered with guard railing. The two stage crossings introduce considerable delay for pedestrians.		
DIRECTNESS				4		
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.	0		
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.	0		
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.	1		
SAFETY				1		
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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.	1	Tactile paving is provided at some side road junctions but not at for example the bus station access points.	Review provision of tactile paving and install where required.
COHERENCE				1		
			Total Score	18		

Route Name	Birmingham Road
Length	620 metres
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	8
Directness	4
Safety	1
Coherence	1
Total	18

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
I. 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.	1	There are examples of damaged flags and some failed kerbs at side roads resulting in evidence of ponding.	Replace damaged and uneven flags. Repair failed kerbs.
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).	1		
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	0	This is a very busy road, the narrow footpaths makes it an uncomfortable environment.	Very difficult to deal with due to Historic buildings causing a number of the footway pinch points. Further speed reduction measures would
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issinguished Evidence that lighting is not present. Temporary features affecting the attractive is the second of the sec	or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sack	s).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				2		
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 lootway crosso	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	1		
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.	0	There are some very narrow sections of footway and some localised pinch points due to the historic building line.	See above.
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.		In places the footway is pinched to a width below 1 metre.	Without major changes to the traffic using the roa it is difficult to see how footways could be widened adjacen to historic buildings.
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 crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
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).	1	There are short slopes at side road crossings.	
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; an Bus shelters restricting clearance w 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dr d				
COMFORT				4		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	1	Although the majority of side road crossings are direct there is one set back due to poor visibility caused by the building line.	
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).	0	Mainly due to the lack of pedestrian crossing facilities at the Birmingham Road Signal controlled junction.	Provide facilities for pedestrians at the Birmingham Road junction.
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.	0	There are no facilities for pedestrians to cross the road at the Birmingham Road signal controlled junction.	See above.
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.	1		
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;				
DIRECTNESS				4		
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.	0	High traffic volumes coupled with narrow footpaths.	See above.
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.	1	Traffic speeds probably 'Feel' faster than they actually are due to pedestrians inability (due to narrow footways) to keep any distance from the traffic.	
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.	1		Junction radii could be tightened up where possible to slow turning manouvres and improve visibility.
SAFETY				2		
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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.	1		Review tactile paving provision.
			Total Score	13		

Route Name	St John's Street
Length	275
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	4
Directness	4
Safety	2
Coherence	1
Total	13

Comments	
Actions	

	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. 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.	1	Minor faults in the footway due to utility re-instatements.	Re-surface where possible.
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		
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	0	At the time of the audit temporary signals were in operation on Swan Road causing queues of traffic.	The audit took place during unusual circumstances.
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attra Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS	- Excessive use of guardian of boliands			3		
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 pawment, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	1		
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.	1	Historic building lines pause footway pinch points.	
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.	0		
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.	1		
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).	1		
10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting cl - Barriers/gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance wic	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drivi	eway gates opened into footway);			
		nn. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfa	aces			
	- Poorly drained footways resulting in r	noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfa		4		
COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Poorly drained footways resulting in r Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent		Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	4		
-footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS -location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS -gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if illkely to cross outside of controlled	- Poorly drained footways resulting in r Footways are provided to cater for	noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfa	Footways are not provided to cater for		The Sanford Street crossing point is wide and set back a long way.	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross	Poorly drained footways resulting in representations are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to read). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (c. 5s.)	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting productions are with the control of the cont	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay	1	point is wide and set back a	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled	- Poorly drained footways resulting in re- Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to read). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, 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.	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 benefits from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Footways are not provided to cater 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 journey time. Likely to wait >10s in	1 1 2	point is wide and set back a	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossing) resent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS	- Poorly drained footways resulting in re- Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing 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 55s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include:	Footways are not provided to cater 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 journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	1 1 2	point is wide and set back a long way. Responses at both pedestrian crossing where within 4 seconds. Both had 5 seconds.	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossing present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS	-Poorly drained footways resulting in re- Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (e. 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 toffrom bus stops not accommodating accoss for all users;	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing 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 pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Footways are not provided to cater 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 journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	1 1 2	point is wide and set back a long way. Responses at both pedestrian crossing where within 4 seconds. Both had 5 seconds.	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other	-Poorly drained footways resulting in re- Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (e. 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 toffrom bus stops not accommodating accoss for all users;	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing 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 55s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include:	Footways are not provided to cater 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 journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	1 1 2 2 2	point is wide and set back a long way. Responses at both pedestrian crossing where within 4 seconds. Both had 5 seconds.	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossing) resent of if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY	- Poorly drained footways resulting in re- Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, 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 - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating layout for pedestrians creating access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating layout	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 are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait 5-5 in pedietrian staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait 5-5 in pedietrian standard green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved.	Footways are not provided to cater 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 journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable useers 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.	1 1 2 2 2	point is wide and set back a long way. Responses at both pedestrian crossing where within 4 seconds. Both had 5 seconds.	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossing) resent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility	- Poorly drained footways resulting in re- Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, 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. Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians created and the produced and the produced and the produced are traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	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. Crossing 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 pedestrian island: Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: noclated: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	Footways are not provided to cater 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 time. 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.	1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 7 0 0 0 1 1	point is wide and set back a long way. Responses at both pedestrian crossing where within 4 seconds. Both had 5 seconds.	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	- Poorly drained footways resulting in it Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, 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 accom Siteps restricting access for all users, - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea Traffic volumes. Traffic volumes. Good visibility for all users.	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 are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait 5-5 in pedietrian staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait 5-5 in pedietrian standard green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved.	Footways are not provided to cater 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 journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable useers 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.	1 1 1 2 2 2 7 0 0 0 1 1	point is wide and set back a long way. Responses at both pedestrian crossing where within 4 seconds. Both had 5 seconds.	
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossing) present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossing on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile	- Poorly drained footways resulting in it Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, 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 accom Siteps restricting access for all users, - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea Traffic volumes. Traffic volumes. Good visibility for all users.	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 are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait 5-5s in pedestrian island. Padestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. 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 paving provided, albeit not ocurrent	Footways are not provided to cater 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 time. 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. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 7 7 0 0 1 1 1 1	point is wide and set back a long way. Responses at both pedestrian crossing where within 4 seconds. Both had 5 second green times.	

Route Name	Swan Road
Length	340
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	4
Directness	7
Safety	1
Coherence	1
Total	16

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	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		
. 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		
B. 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	1		
I. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu- Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attr- Excessive use of guardrail or bollard:	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				5		
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 pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
5. 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		
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.	1		
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		
9. COMFORT	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).	1	Church Street slopes down gradually to Greenhill.	
- gradient 10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wide 	lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drivi	eway gates opened into footway);			
COMFORT				8		
11.DIRECTNESS	Footways are provided to cater for	Footway provision could be improved	Footways are not provided to cater for	2		
footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in	pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	1	There is a desire line crossing Church Street at the	
relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 14 gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross butside 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).	1	pedestrian access to Tesco.	
A.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	The Church Street crossing at the Rotten Row signal controlled junction is two phase with a stagger. During the audit waiting times of 50 seconds and 20 seconds were recorded.	
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.	1		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cre-	modated;				
DIRECTNESS				5		
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.	0	This is a busy road giving access to the central area. Footways are adjacent to the carriageway.	
18.SAFETY	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.	1		
<u> </u>	Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	1		
19.SAFETY - visibility	Good visibility for all users.	but unlikely to result in collisions.				
- visibility SAFETY				2		
19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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		
19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect.			

Route Name	Church Street
Length	90
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	8
Directness	5
Safety	2
Coherence	2
Total	22

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation.	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent.	2		
- maintenance	significant issues noted.	Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	_		
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		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu- Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attr- Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).		No vehicles were observed on this street during the audit. Very much pedestrian dominated.	
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
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 pawment, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	1	Minor defects to the setts in places.	
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		
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.	2		
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		
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		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance with 	ther' comfort issues include: bstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); s restricting access; and				
COMFORT				9		
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		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled	Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2		
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		
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		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians creations	include: modated; ;				
DIRECTNESS				10		
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		
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.	2		
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		
SAFETY				6		
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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.	1		
COHERENCE				1		
			Total Score	32		
POLITE SLIMMARY				I		

A. Control of the Con	
Route Name	
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	9
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	1
Total	32

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. 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		
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		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attra Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	·).		High quality predominantly pedestrian area.	
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
5. COMFORT - condition		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		
6. COMFORT - footway width	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		
7. COMFORT - width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Withs 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.	2		
8. COMFORT - footway parking	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		
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		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wide 	es include: ting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); ss; and				
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	Traffic flows are negigable and therefore no formal crossing points are required.	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossings	Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2		
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		
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.		Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2		
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other		Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include: modated;	vulnerable users sufficient time to	2		
green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS	to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accuse - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include: modated; : ating severance issues for users.	vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	10		
- green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS	to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i Routes to/from bus stops not accom Steps restricting access for all users	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include: modated;	vulnerable users sufficient time to			
- green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY	to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes toffrom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cresion - Confusing layout for pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	Podestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. nclude: modated; stigg severance issues for users.	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.	10		
green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed	to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues: - Routes to firom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Conflusing layout for pedestrians cres Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: Incl	vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians	10		
- green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility	to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues: - Routes to firom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. nclude: nclude: ting severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat	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.	10 2 2		
- green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues: - Routes to firom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: Incl	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.	10 2 2 2		
- green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and	to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues: Routes toffrom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cret Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. nclude: modated; string severance issues for users. 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 paving provided, albeit not to current	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. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	10 2 2 2 2		

Route Name	Breadmarket Street
Length	70 metres
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	34

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	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		
. 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		
i. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness Examples of 'other' attractiveness issues.	could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2		
other	- Evidence that lighting is not present,	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
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 pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
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		
r. COMFORT width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without give and take between users or walking on roads. Wridths 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 wheelch air width). Limited width requires users to "give and take" frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	1	Conduit Street is very busy with pedestrians walking on the road as the footways are compromised by the building layouts. Parked cars (in designated bays) also narrow the carriageway. Potential conflict can occur when small numbers of whickes use the road when vehicles are parked and pedestrian movements are heavy.	
s. 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		
O. COMFORT	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 10.COMFORT · other	exoced 8 per cent (1 in 12). [12). Examples of 'other' comfort issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers/gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance width Poorly drained footways resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces		2			
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		
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		
I3.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		
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.	2		
5. DIRECTNESS green man time		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		
6.DIRECTNESS other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: Routes tofrom bus stops not accommodated; Steps restricting access for all users; Confusing juyout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
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.	2		
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.	2		
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.			
20. COHERENCE dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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		
COHERENCE				2		

Route Name	Conduit Street
Length	115 metres
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	11
Directness	10
Safety	4
Coherence	2
Total	33

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no	1 1	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent.	1		
- maintenance	significant issues noted. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint). Including low branche furniture falling into m		Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	•		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS - fear of crime	apropriate natural surveillance. frontage and natural surveillance (e.g., Evidence of criminal/antsocial houses set back or back onto street), activity. Route is isolated, not sub to natural surveillance (including		activity. Route is isolated, not subject	2		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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	0		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attr - Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).			
ATTRACTIVENESS	•			3		
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 pawment, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	1		
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.	0	Footways are very narrow in places, noteably at the George Lane corner.	
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.	0		
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	Waiting restrictions are in place. Road space has been maximised for capacity at the signal controlled junctions.	
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).	1	Greenhill slopes down gently towards the centre.	
10.COMFORT - other	 Temporary obstructions restricting cl Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance with 	Examples of other comfort issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers/gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance width Poorty drianel footways resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces				
COMFORT				4		
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		
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.	1	The slip lane to Gresley Row takes pedestrians off the direct desire line.	
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).	0		
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.	0	The phasing at the Rotten Row signal controlled junction results in considerable delay for pedestrians at the Greenhill arm.	
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		
16.DIRECTNESS - other						
DIRECTNESS				5		
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.	0		
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.	1		
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.	1		
SAFETY				2		
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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.	1		
COHERENCE				1		
			Total Score	15		

Route Name	Greenhill
Length	60 metres
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	4
Directness	5
Safety	2
Coherence	1
Total	15

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS - maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no 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.	2		
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		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and	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	1		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu- Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attr- Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				5		
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, subsiding or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
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.	1	The footway narrows in places.	
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.	1	The Cross Keys / Lombard Streer junction is wide and vehicle speeds can be high. The droped kerbs are set well back from the desire line.	
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		
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).	1		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance with 	learance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri				
COMFORT				7		
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.	1		
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.	1		
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).	1		
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		
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		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of other directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
DIRECTNESS				7		
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.	1		
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.	1		
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		
SAFETY		comartillis.		4		
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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.	1		
COHERENCE				1		
			Total Score	24		

Route Name	Lombard Street
Length	110
Name of Assessor(s)	James Lowe
Date of Assessment	02 August 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	7
Directness	7
Safety	4
Coherence	1
Total	24

Comments	
Actions	