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.

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Liverpool Road

JORGECTNESS - agree in traffic (where no controlled and entire delay in the controlled	Liverpool Road						
- Institutations or specific states root specific states or code specific states are code specific states are code specific states are code or companies specific states are code or companies specific states are code or c		,, ,,	,,		Score	Comments	Actions
International control of control	- 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.	1		
- tradition contains and discovered the control process of the property developed and process of the property features affecting of process of the process of process of process of process of the process of pro	- fear of crime	appropriate natural surveillance.	frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Evidence of criminallantisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	1		
- COMFORT - Commonwealth of the commonwealth o	- traffic noise and	affect the attractiveness	pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise			
S. COMFORT Controlled		 Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the att 	or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sack	s).	2		
condition, with no tip hearth. All this sportment close of the control of the co	ATTRACTIVENESS				5		
		Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some frontway crossowers resulting in	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant	2		
		without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	(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		
Tobusery parking brownly in code Clearance with a promptly in code of in theseses brownly in code of in the code of included to the footing parking due to footing parking the code of the code of included to the footing parking the code of the code o	- width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	 5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. 	standard wheelchair width), Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
Processing of content and street of the continue bears to the content bears to the continue bears to the content of the content of the content bears to the conte	- footway parking	footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	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.	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		
19.COMPORT Empires of other control resource vacable Combined Composition (e.g. driveway grates operand into trously)		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		
Contempt provision Contempt and provision Contempt provision Con	10.COMFORT - other	Temporary obstructions restricting of Barriers/gates restricting access; an Bus shelters restricting clearance will	learance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri 1 Ith.	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
Consequence					11		
Consequence of the content of the		pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	improved to better cater for	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
controlled crossingly or cross outside of one of the present or if Italy or cross outside of one of the present or if Italy or cross outside of one of the present or if Italy or cross outside of one of the present of Italy or cross outside of one of the present or if Italy or cross outside of one of the present of Italy or cross outside of one of the present of Italy or cross outside of one of the present of Italy or cross outside of outside of the present of Italy or cross outside of outside of the present of Italy or cross outside of the present of Italy of Italy or cross outside of the present of Italy of Italy or cross outside of the present outside of the present outside of the present outside of Italy or cross outside of the present outside of Italy or cross outside of Italy or cross outside outsi	- location of crossings in	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting		1		treatment or dropped kerbs. See also link to cycle/pe
- Impact of controlled	- gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	average).	associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	or associated with significant delay (>15s average).			
- green mail time Consist continuity Security Se	- impact of controlled crossings on journey time	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.			
- Other - Roda to North but stops on a commodated Stops section growth or statement of section of the Stops section growth or statement. - Stops section growth or productions or commodated Stops section growth or productions or commodated Traffic volume to see or productions Traffic volume but of section or control section or code proteins Traffic volume but of section or code proteins Traffic volume have but form modated and self-to-section modated and self-to-section or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions or framework or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions or framework or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions or framework or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions or framework or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions or framework or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions or framework or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions or framework or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions or framework or code proteins Traffic volume to see or productions Traffic volume, with pro		Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	extended green man time but current	vulnerable users sufficient time to	2		
TREASETY Intelligence with the process of the control of the contr		 Routes to/from bus stops not accord Steps restricting access for all users 	imodated;		1		
-traffic volume an key dataset from moderate productions in close posethy: -traffic volume and key dataset from moderate and the set of the control of the control of the set of the control of the control of the set of the					10		
## 18.AFETY In this genet but on legs distant from modurate and legs distant from modurate and legs distant from modurate ## 19.AFETY ## 1		can keen distance from moderate	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2	NB. Currently bounded by former supermarket site with temporary use as a public car	
19.SAFETY Visibility Ocold venilably for all users. Visibility ocold to comental report of siles of the siles		Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate		unable to keep their distance from	2		
SAFETY Jordan 20. COMERNICE Adequate dropped serbs and tacella paring dropped serbs and tacella paring clared by the composed serbs and tacella paring clared by the compose			Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in	Poor visibility, likely to result in	2		
-dropped kerbs and starting privides. provides, albeit not to current aboret or incorrent. point near Pyecorth end. Preparative of starting privides. privides and starting parking provides. The starting privides and starting parking provides. The starting parking provides and starting parking pa	,		collisions.	1	6		
	- dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision.	provided, albeit not to current	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect.		No dropped kerbs at crossing point near Ryecroft end.	Possible entry treatment or dropped kerbs. See
Total Score 33	CONERENCE			Total Score	33		

ROUTE SUMMARY

Length		
Name of Assessor(s)		
Date of Assessm	ent	02 October 2011
Criterion		Performance Scores
Attractiveness		
Comfort		1
Directness		1
Safety		
Coherence		
Total		3
Commente		present due to relocation of supermarket and

Entry treatment to connect to ped/cycle crossing at Ryecroft.

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Bridge St and High St

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	Footways and zebra crossings on gyratory. Rest of High St is VRA.	
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	Access-only for vehicles at Bridge St. Rest of High St is	
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	·).	2		
ATTRACTIVENESS	- Excessive use of guardrain of boliard.			8		
5. COMFORT - condition	Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted 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	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		
9. COMFORT - gradient 10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gates restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wi	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). lude: learance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri d	12). veway gates opened into footway);	1	Some A boards and traders vehicles within footways.	
- gradient 10.COMFORT	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gates restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wi	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri'd d dth.	12). veway gates opened into footway);	11		
- gradient 10.COMFORT - other COMFORT	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gates restricting cacess, an - Bus shelters restricting cleans - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri'd d dth.	12). veway gates opened into footway);	1		
- gradient 10.COMFORT - other COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gates restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting cleans; of - Poorly drained footways resulting in - Footways are provided to cater for	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drid d) thth: noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Footway provision could be improved	12). veway gates opened into footway); aces Footways are not provided to cater	11		
- gradient 10.COMFORT - other COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Tamporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gales restricting access, and - Bus shelters restricting clearance with - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drid dt noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting	12). veway gates opened into footway); accs Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from	11 2		
- gradient 10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - apps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Tamporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gales restricting access, and - Bus shelters restricting clearance with - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). ude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri	12). www.y gates opened into footway); acces 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	11 2 2		
- gradient 10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT 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	Examples of 'other' comfort issues in - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gates restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). iude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dright). toticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Footway provision could be improved to better rater 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 2-5s in pedestrian	12). weway gates opened into footway); acces 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	11 2 2 2 2		
- gradient 10.COMFORT - other COMFORT 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	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gates restricting access, and - Bus shelters restricting cleanses with - Poorly drained footways resulting in 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	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). ude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri dri th. toticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Feotway 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. include: modated;	reway gates opened into footway); acces Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian 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	11 2 2 2 2	vehicles within footways.	
- gradient 10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT 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 crossings 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Temporary obstructions restricting or - Barriers/gates restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting clearance wi - Poorly drained footways resulting in the state of the state	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). ude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri dri th. toticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Feotway 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. include: modated;	reway gates opened into footway); acces 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 cross comfortably.	1 11 2 2 2 2 2	vehicles within footways.	
- gradient 10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT 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 - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Barriers/gaise restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pediestrian 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 to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes toffrom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cru Traffic volume low, or pedestrians Traffic volume Tr	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). ude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri dri th. toticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Feotway 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. include: modated;	reway gates opened into footway); acces 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 cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	1 11 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1	vehicles within footways. n/a NB. Currently bounded by former supermarket site with	
- gradient 10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT - other COMFORT 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 - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - traffic volume 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Tamporary obstructions restricting cl - Barriers/gates restricting access; an Eus shelter settlicting clearance wi - Poorly drained footways resulting in the Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s 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 accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Conflusing layout for pedestrians creat reading to the crossing layout for pedestrians created traffic volumes. Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drid dth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf 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. include: include: include: interest in the properties of the	reway gates opened into footway); acces 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 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 11 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 11 11	vehicles within footways.	
- gradient 10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT 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 crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossings) 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	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting: - Temporary obstructions restricting: - Bastriers/gates restricting access - Bus shelters restricting clearance wi Poorly drained footways resulting in the state of the sta	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). ude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drid dr.) roticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire inest. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include: modated; isting severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	reway gates opened into footway); acces Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian 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 11 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 11 2 2	vehicles within footways. n/a NB. Currently bounded by former supermarket site with	
- gradient 10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - apps in traffic (where no controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - the province of the province	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Bastriers/gates restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in - Teodrays 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 to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes tofrom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drid dth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian sland. 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	reway gates opened into footway); acces 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 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 11 2 2 2 1 1 11 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	vehicles within footways. n/a NB. Currently bounded by former supermarket site with	
- gradient 10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings) 14.DIRECTNESS - green to rif likely to cross outside of controlled crossings) 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 - visibility	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Temporary obstructions restricting of - Bastriers/gates restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in - Teodrays 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 to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes tofrom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). ude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drid dr.) roticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire inest. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include: modated; isting severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	reway gates opened into footway); acces 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 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 11 2 2 2 2 1 1 11 2 2 2 2 6 6	vehicles within footways. n/a NB. Currently bounded by former supermarket site with	

Route Name	Bridge St to High St
Length	500m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	11
Directness	11
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	38

	Bridge St provides access to business and for court vehicles. Central part of High St is part of fully pedestrianised area.
Actions	None proposed.



Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme The Midway

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no	, ,	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent.	1		
- 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).	1		
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).	1		
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 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		
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.	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	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance with 	learance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri		1		
COMFORT				6		
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).	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.	1	n/a	
16.DIRECTNESS - other	 Routes to/from bus stops not accom Steps restricting access for all users 	time unlikely to deter users. cross comfortably. 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.				
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		
SAFETY				3		
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	23		

Route Name	The Midway
Length	200m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	6
Directness	8
Safety	3
Coherence	2
Total	23

Comments	The Midway provides access to a multi-storey car park and for servicing of the shopping centre. It is not a primary pedestrian route. Footways are provided.
Actions	None proposed.

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Church St and Merrial Street

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 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		
- traffic noise and pollution 4. ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu		traine rioise	1		
- 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		
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.	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.	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	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wide 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drivi		1		
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).	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	n/a	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2	n/a	
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;		1		
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.	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.	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.	1		
SAFETY				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	29		

Route Name	Church St and Merrial St
Length	250m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	8
Directness	10
Safety	4
Coherence	1
Total	20

Comments	Church St runs up from Lower St into the town centre. Merrial St extends northwards to Ryecroft and is part of a bus route through the town. There are no pedestrian crossing points or dropped kerbs along Merrial St apart from at the junction with High St.
Actions	Crossing at northern end of Merrial St.







Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Ironmarket

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 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		
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)).	1	Minor vandalism.	
ATTRACTIVENESS				7		
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.	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).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drive		1	Some ponding at pedestrian crossing point.	
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	n/a	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2	n/a	
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accomr - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creations	include: nodated;		2		
DIRECTNESS				12		
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 moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	2		
19.SAFETY - visibility	traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2		
SAFETY				6		
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		
paving						
Paving COHERENCE			Total Score	37		

Route Name	Ironmarket
Length	250m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	10
Directness	12
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	37

	Attractive pedestrianised street with limited access at northern end adjacent to park.
Actions	No action.





Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Market Lane

Audit Catanania	2 (0)	4 (8	0 (D+4)	C	C	A-4:
Audit Categories 1. ATTRACTIVENESS	2 (Green) Footways well maintained, with no	1 (Amber) Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation.	0 (Red) Littering and/or dog mess prevalent.	Score 2	Comments	Actions
- 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		
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 do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2		
- traffic noise and 4. ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	ues include:		1	Minor vandalism.	
- other	Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attr Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				7		
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, subside 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.	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).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance with 	learance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri		2		
COMFORT				11		
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	n/a	
15. 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.	2	n/a	
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	modated; ;		2		
DIRECTNESS				12		
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	38		

Route Name	Castle Walk
Length	80m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	11
Directness	12
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	38

Comments	Attractive pedestrianised street with access to bus station.
Actions	No action.





Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Friars St and Hassall St

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no	, ,	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	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g.	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial	2		
- fear of crime	appropriate natural surveillance.	frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Evidence or criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).			
3. ATTRACTIVENESS	Traffic noise and pollution do not	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe	1		
- traffic noise and 4. ATTRACTIVENESS	affect the attractiveness Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	could be improved	traffic noise	1	Minor vandalism/litter near	
- other	- Evidence that lighting is not present,	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).	'	bus station.	
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.	1		
7. COMFORT	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited	0		
- width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	without give and take between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for give and take' between users and walking on roads.	startoard writeercrair worth; Lithied width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.			
8. COMFORT	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths	Clearance widths between	Clearance widths less than 1.5m.	1		
- footway parking	tootways noted. Clearance worths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	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.	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.			
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	slopes due to topography - as in all southern edge of town	
10.COMFORT	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc	lude:		1		
- other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance with 					
COMFORT				6		
11.DIRECTNESS	Footways are provided to cater for	Footway provision could be improved	Footways are not provided to cater	2		
- footway provision	pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	for pedestrian desire lines.	_		
12.DIRECTNESS	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting	Crossings deviate significantly from	1	No pedestrian crossing at	
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS	Crossing of road easy, direct, and	pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but	desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect,	2	southern end of friars St.	
- gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	or associated with significant delay (>15s average).			
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	n/a	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2	n/a	
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	modated; ;		2		
DIRECTNESS				11		
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	some interaction in vicinity of bus station	
18.SAFETY - traffic speed	Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	2		
19.SAFETY - visibility	traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	1		
SAFETY		comardità.		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	Area between bus station and crossing of Barracks Road could be improved to create a more attractive route. No	
COHERENCE				1		
			Total Score	28		

Route Name	Friars St and Hassall St
Length	400m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	6
Directness	11
Safety	4
Coherence	1
Total	28

	Improved environment at northern end where there is part time access for taxi and access to bus station.
Actions	Streetscape works to bring northern end of street up to similar standard as the fully pedestrianised areas. Crossing/entry treatment at southern end of Friars st by Lower St.









Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme

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).	1	little active frontage.	
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	 Evidence that lighting is not present, 	xamples of 'other' attractiveness issues include: Eventual Free Control of the C		1	Minor vandalism/litter and unattractive.	
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 univern 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.	1		
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.	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).	0	subway access at junctions.	
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; an Bus shelters restricting clearance wi 	learance width for pedestrians (e.g. dri		1		
COMFORT				6		
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	Crossing of road easy, direct, and					
present or if likely to cross outside of	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		
present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled	average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	associated with some delay (up to	or associated with significant delay	1		
present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time	average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	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	or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in			
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	average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient	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 steland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include: modated;	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 unlerable users sufficient time to	1		
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	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 tofforn bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cre	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: include: integration of the product	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 witherable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	1		
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	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 accom - Stops restricting access for all users	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 steland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include: modated;	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 unlerable users sufficient time to	0		
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 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY	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 account - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cre Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	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: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close provimity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close provimity.	or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >105 in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	1 0 1		
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 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY	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 tofforn bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cre Traffic volume low, or pedestrians crankeep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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. Includes: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in	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 witherable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	1 0 1 1 4 0 0		
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 - visibility	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 tofform bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cream keep distance from moderate traffic volume. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	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 steland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include: modated; along severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat	or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian istand. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	1 0 1 4 0 0 0		
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 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic volume 19.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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 tofform bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cream keep distance from moderate traffic volume. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	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. Includes: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in	or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian istand. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	1 0 0 1 4 4 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1		
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 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and	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 tofrom bus stops not accome. Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cream content of the	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 stead. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: modated; iating 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	or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian sland. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	1 1 4 4 0 0 1 1 1 1 1		

	Route Name	Ryecroft
	Length	250m
Name o	of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of	f Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	6
Directness	4
Safety	1
Coherence	1
Total	16

	Northern section of ring road with subways at Lower St and Nelson Place plus a staggered pelican crossing near
	Brampton Place. Side road crossings not in line with desire
Actions	Replace current two-stage crossing with single stage parallel ped and cycle signalised crossings. Improve and widen shared footway/cycle tracks to link to adjacent streets.













Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Lower St

	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).	1		
B. ATTRACTIVENESS	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	0		
traffic noise and pollution ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	ues include:	tiano noto	1	Minor vandalism/litter and	
other	Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attr Excessive use of guardrail or bollard.	activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks).		unattractive.	
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 or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	0	Very poor conditions on south- west side of road near Lidl and Travelodge.	
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.	0	Very poor conditions on south- west side of road near Lidl and Travelodge.	
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	Very poor conditions on south- west side of road near Lidl and Travelodge.	
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.	1		
O. COMFORT	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in	0	subway access at junctions.	
gradient		exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	12).			
IO.COMFORT other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wide 	lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv i	reway gates opened into footway);	1		
0.COMFORT other	Temporary obstructions restricting of Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance with Poorly drained footways resulting in the control of the control	lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv f th. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf.	eway gates opened into footway); aces	2		
O.COMFORT COMFORT 1.DIRECTNESS	Temporary obstructions restricting of Barriers/Gales restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance widen - Poorty drained footways resulting in the Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Lude: Berance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv) 1 1th. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf. Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	eway gates opened into footway); aces			
COMFORT COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in	Temporary obstructions restricting at Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance widen a Poorty drained footways resulting in the Footways are provided to cater for	lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv dth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf-	eway gates opened into footway); aces Footways are not provided to cater for	2	Very indirect at Pool Dam	
10.COMFORT 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 putside of controlled	- Temporary obstructions restricting acress; an - Bus shelters restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	lude: aurance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv d th. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf. Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting	eway gates opened into footway); aces Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from	2	Very indirect at Pool Dam	
OLOMFORT OTHER OTH	- Temporary obstructions restricting acress; an - Bus shelters restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Lude: cerance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv d th. oblicable ponding issues/slippery surf- liperature of the control of the control 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	eway gates opened into footway); aces 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	2 1 0	Very indirect at Pool Dam Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to topography.	
IO.COMFORT OTHER O	- Temporary obstructions restricting acress; an - Bus shelters restricting acress; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5 average). Crossings are single phase	Jude: aerance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv sth. hooticeable ponding issues/slippery surfi 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 read direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to whose to pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 unherable users sufficient time to	2 1 0	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
10.COMFORT 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	- Temporary obstructions restricting acress; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in I Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Great man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes toffrom bus stops nat accom - Stops restricting access for all users.	Jude: aurance width for pedestrians (e.g. drividant). Thin. hooticeable ponding issues/slippery surfice to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossing partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are atlaggered 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. Includie: modated;	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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	2 1 1 0 0	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
IO.COMFORT other II.DIRECTNESS footway provision II.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines II.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings oresent or if likely to cross utside of controlled crossing) II.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time II.DIRECTNESS green man time II.DIRECTNESS other	- Temporary obstructions restricting acres - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting clearance wirely access - Poorly drained footways resulting in the control of the control	Jude: aurance width for pedestrians (e.g. drividant). Thin. hooticeable ponding issues/slippery surfice to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossing partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are atlaggered 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. Includie: modated;	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 unherable users sufficient time to	2 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
O.COMFORT other COMFORT 1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings resent or if likely to cross vulside of controlled crossing) 4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 5. DIRECTNESS green man time 6.DIRECTNESS other	- Temporary obstructions restricting, ac Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in the provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to read). 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 - Solutes tofform bus stops not accom Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cre-	Jude: avanance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv sth. hooticeable ponding issues/slippery surf Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossing 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: ating severance issues for users.	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 cross confortably.	2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 4 4	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
ID.COMFORT COMFORT III.DIRECTNESS footway provision IZ.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines III.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings) present or if likely to cross under the controlled crossing or controlled crossings) IA.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time IS. DIRECTNESS green man time IB.DIRECTNESS other DIRECTNESS IT.SAFETY traffic volume	- Temporary obstructions restricting and - Barriers/gates restricting access restricting access and - Bus shelters restricting access and - Bus shelters restricting access and - Bus shelters restricting clearance with - Poortry drained footways resulting in 1 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 (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 toftrom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cra Keep distance from moderate traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volume.	Jude: asarance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv th. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf colleable ponding issues/slippery surf provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting crossings partially diverting 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: ating severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	1 1 1 1 4 4 0 0	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
IDLOMFORT OTHER INTERPRETATION INTERPRETATI	- Temporary obstructions restricting, ac Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in the state of th	Jude: aurance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv sth. hooticeable ponding issues/slippery surf to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossing 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 sistand. Pedestrians would benefit from setended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: Incl	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 witherable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 4 4	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
IO.COMFORT Other COMFORT II.DIRECTNESS footway provision I2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines II.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings) II.DIRECTNESS green and controlled crossings II.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings II.DIRECTNESS green man time II.DIRECTNESS green man time II.DIRECTNESS Other II.DIRECTNESS III.DIRECTNESS III.DIR	- Temporary obstructions restricting acrea Bus shelters restricting clearance wi Poorly drained footways resulting in I - Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to read). - Crossings follow desire lines. - Crossings follow desire lines. - Crossings follow desire lines. - Crossings are single phase pelicanipuffin or zebra crossings. - Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. - Examples of other directness issues Routes toffrom bus stops not accom Steps restricting access for all users Confusing layout for pedestrians cre - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. - Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians - Can keep distance from moderate	Jude: aurance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv sth. hooticeable ponding issues/slippery surfi Footway provision could be improved for better cater for pedestrian 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 pedestrian sland. Pedestrians would be pedestrian sland. Pedestrians would be personal time unlikely to deter users. include: modated; ating severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 witherable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
IO.COMFORT Other COMFORT II.DIRECTNESS footway provision II.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines II.DIRECTNESS II.DIRECTNESS II.DIRECTNESS II.DIRECTNESS III.DIRECTNESS III.DIRE	- Temporary obstructions restricting acres are as shelters restricting acres restricting acres as - Bus shelters restricting acres as - Bus shelters restricting acres as - Bus shelters restricting clearance with property of the shelter shelters are shelters as a shelter restricting acres as a shelter for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to read). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues. Routes toffrom bus stops not accomediate to the stop of the	Jude: asarance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv sth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfi 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 >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include:	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 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.	2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 4 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
10.COMFORT 10.COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS 15.DIRECTNESS 10.COATION 12.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 15.DIRECTNESS 15.DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 19.SAFETY 19.SAFET	- Temporary obstructions restricting, ac Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in the state of th	Jude: asarance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv sth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfi 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 >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. include:	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Indirect staggered crossing by Church st but in part due to	
IO.COMFORT Other COMFORT III.DIRECTNESS I-footway provision III.DIRECTNESS Iocation of crossings in elation to desire lines III.DIRECTNESS III.DIRECTNE	- Temporary obstructions restricting, ac Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting access - Bus shelters restricting clearance wit - Poorly drained footways resulting in the state of th	Jude: aurance width for pedestrians (e.g. drividath). Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossing partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings of read 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: modated; Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	eway gates opened into footway); acces 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 witherable 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.	2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Indirect staggered crossing by Church at but in part due to topography.	

Route Name	Lower St
Length	250m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

*	
Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	2
Directness	4
Safety	1
Coherence	0
Total	11

Comments	Links are unpleasant due to lack of active frontage and proximity of traffic. Subways at regular intervals (each major junction) but
	not pleasant.
	Replace subway crossings with single stage parallel ped and
Actions	cycle signalised crossings for better access to retailers and
	residences on outside of ring road











Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Barracks Road

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 fumiture 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).	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	very busy road	
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).	1	Minor vandalism/litter and unattractive.	
ATTRACTIVENESS				4		
5. COMFORT - condition	Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or pratching) 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	generally good.	
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		
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.	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).	0	subway access at junctions.	
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv		1	subway entrances leading to Queens Gardens/Nelson Place and at Grosvenor Rbt/London rd are unnattractive although the gardens and landscaping	
COMFORT				5		
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	main issue here is the severence between the town centre and area immediately east which has schools and residences.	
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	Crossing routing at end of High St/Paradise St is poor. Linkage of the two halves of Hassell St is via staggered puffin crossing.	
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		
- 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	n/a	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	2	n/a	
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accomr - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea-	modated;	cross comfortably.	1	Poor route around bus station from stubbs st to Hassell St.	
DIRECTNESS	7			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.	0		
18.SAFETY - traffic speed	Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	0		
19.SAFETY - visibility	traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	traffic.	1		
SAFETY				1		
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.	•	Excessive flare at retail park entrance by Bath Store. No dropped kerbs/factiles at Stubbs St. Windsor St.	Install dropped kerbs/tactiles, entry tretament as well if possible
COHERENCE				1		
			Total Score	18		

Route Name	Barracks Road
Length	250m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	5
Directness	7
Safety	1
Coherence	1
Total	18

Comments	Links are unpleasant due to lack of active frontage and proximity of traffic. Subways at regular intervals (each major junction) but not pleasant.
Actions	Improve subway entrances from footways by widening, guardrail removal, planting etc. Dropped kerbs/tactiles or entry treatments to reduce crossing distance at side roads. Hassell St crossing









Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Audits - Newcastle Under Lyme Pool Dam and Brook Lane

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.	1	- Comments	7.0.10113
- 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	No evidence of vandalism with	Minor vandalism. Lack of active	Major or prevalent vandalism.	1		
- fear of crime	appropriate natural surveillance.	frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).			
3. ATTRACTIVENESS	Traffic noise and pollution do not		Severe traffic pollution and/or severe	0	very busy road	
- traffic noise and 4. ATTRACTIVENESS	affect the attractiveness Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	could be improved	traffic noise	1	Minor vandalism/litter and	
- other	- Evidence that lighting is not present,	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).	1	unattractive.	
ATTRACTIVENESS				3		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated	Large number of footway crossovers	1	generally good.	
- condition	with no trip hazards.	(such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.			
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	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	2		
	2m.		roads and/or results in crowding/delay.			
7. COMFORT	Able to accommodate all users	Widths of between approximately	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e.	1		
- width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.			
8. COMFORT	No instances of vehicles parking on	Clearance widths between	Clearance widths less than 1.5m.	1		
- footway parking	footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	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.	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.			
9. COMFORT	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in	1		
- gradient 10.COMFORT	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	12).	1		
- other	Temporary obstructions restricting cl 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	main issue here is the severence along Lyme Brook Greenway with no/offline crossings.	
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).	0		
14.DIRECTNESS	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in	2	n/a	
- impact of controlled crossings on journey time		Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	pedestrian island.			
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.		n/a	
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians creations	modated; ;		1	Poor route around bus station from stubbs st to Hassell St.	
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.	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	Excessive flare at retail park entrance by Bath Store. No dropped kerbs/tactiles at	Install dropped kerbs/tactiles, entry tretament as well if
COHERENCE				1	Stubbs St. Windsor St.	nossible
			Total Score	19		
			10141 00016	13		

Route Name	Pool Dam and Brook Lane
Length	200m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	02 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	7
Directness	7
Safety	1
Coherence	1
Total	19

Comments	Some narrow footway sections. Retail/commercial frontage with some footway parking noted. Severance at Lower st end Pool Dam- no crossing, and at Greenway.	
Actions	Upgrade existing crossing at Brook Lane with a parallel cycle crossing to serve the Greenway (and widen linking footways). Install new signalised crossing for Greenway at Pool Dam.	



Summary Costs

Location	Intervention	Cost £
Liverpool Road	Entry treatment and raised crossing	6000
High St	None	0
The Midway	None	0
	2 x entry treatment/raised pedestrians	
Church St and Merrial St	crossings	12000
Ironmarket	None	0
Market Lane	None	0
	Minor modifications to widen link to	
	Barracks Road and accommodate cycle	
Friars St and Hassall St	route	6000
	New single stage crossing to replace	
	pelican, widen shared footway to link to	
Ryecroft	Ironmarket and Liverpool Rd	250000
	Entry treatments at side roads and car	
Lower St	parks	30000
	Pedestrian crossing at northern end of Pool	
Lower St	Dam	75000
	Improved pedestrian route linking High St to	
Barracks Road	Hassall St	3000
	Improvements around pedestrian subway	
Barracks Road	entrances on outer side of ring road	40000
Barracks Road	Entry treatments at side roads	18000
Pool Dam and Brook Lane	2x signalised crossings for Greenway	160000
TOTAL		£600,000