Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans

Walking Route Audit Tool

Overview

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

Walking Route Audit Tool Criteria

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

The criteria are:

- attractiveness
- comfort
- directness
- safety
- coherence

How to use the RST

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

0 for poor provision (RED)

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

2 for good quality provision (GREEN)

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

Summary

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

Further Information

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

Acknowledgement

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

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
I. ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	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		
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	2		
traffic noise and pollution ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	es include:	arano noto			
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)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
5. COMFORT		Some defects noted, typically isolated		1	Some utility trenching and	
condition	with no trip hazards.	(such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pawers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.		poor surface at highway crossings.	
S. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	1	Narrow footways less than 2m in front of terraced properties approaching Lammerscote Gyratory.	
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		
3. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT · gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wide 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drivel)				
COMFORT				8		
11.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
2.DIRECTNESS	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting	Crossings deviate significantly from	2		
location of crossings in elation to desire lines	Crossing of road easy, direct, and	pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but	desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect,	2		
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).	-		
I4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	2		
15. DIRECTNESS green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
DIRECTNESS				10		
7.SAFETY	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians	Traffic volume moderate and	High traffic volume, with pedestrians	2		
traffic volume	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians	pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians	2		
traffic speed	can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	pedestrians in close proximity.	unable to keep their distance from traffic.			
19.SAFETY visibility	Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2		
SAFETY				6		
	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	2	Limited crossing points	
- dropped kerbs and tactile paving		provided, albeit not to current standards.	absent or incorrect.		identified for visually impared users, however crossing unlikely due to nature of road	
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving COHERENCE		provided, albeit not to current	absent or incorrect.	2	users, however crossing	

Route Name	North Walls
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	8
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	22

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS - maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation,	2		
		disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.			
	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.	houses set back or back onto street).	activity. Route is isolated, not subject			
			to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).			
			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
3. ATTRACTIVENESS	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2		
- traffic noise and pollution 4. ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	'	titalio liobo			
- other	 Evidence that lighting is not present, 	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated		1		
- condition	with no trip hazards.	(such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant		at accessways and outside cycle shop at South Walls	
		pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs,	uneven patching or trenching.		End	
		prams etc. Some footway crossovers				
		resulting in uneven surface.				
6. COMFORT	Able to accommodate all users	Footway widths of between	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e.	1	Some tree intrusion at	
- footway width	without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads.	approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take'	standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give		narrower South Walls end although footway wider on	
	Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	between users and walking on roads.	and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		opposite side.	
7. OOMII OKT	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	2		
crossings/	or walking on roads. Widths generally	'give and take' between users and	width requires users to 'give and take'			
	in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	walking on roads.	frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.			
	No instances of vehicles parking on	Clearance widths between	Clearance widths less than 1.5m.	2		
rooting parting	footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between	approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take'	Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on			
	permanent obstructions.	between users and walking on roads due to footway parking.	roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking			
		Footway parking causes some	causes significant deviation from			
9. COMFORT	There are no slopes on footway.	deviation from desire lines. Slopes exist but gradients do not	desire lines. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in			
- gradient		exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	12).	2		
10.COMFORT	Examples of 'other' comfort issues inc - Temporary obstructions restricting cla	lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv	eway gates opened into footway):			
- other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and 	I	onay gatos oportos into rootnay),			
	 Bus shelters restricting clearance wid Poorly drained footways resulting in r 	nn. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfa	aces			
COMFORT				8		
11.DIRECTNESS	Footways are provided to cater for	Footway provision could be improved	Footways are not provided to cater for	2		
	pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	to better cater for pedestrian desire	pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting	Crossings deviate significantly from	2		
- location of crossings in		pedestrians away from desire lines.	desire lines.			
relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS	Crossing of road easy, direct, and	Crossing of road direct, but	Crossing of road associated indirect,	2		
- gaps in traffic (where no	comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	_		
controlled crossings present or if likely to cross			(* 100 = 101 = 50)			
outside of controlled						
crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS	Crossings are single phase	Crossings are staggered but do not	Staggered crossings add significantly	2		
- impact of controlled	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	2		
crossings on journey time		island.	pouostridiri isidiriu.			
	Green man time is of sufficient length		Green man time would not give	2		
- green man time	to cross comfortably.	extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.			
16.DIRECTNESS	Examples of 'other' directness issues	include:				
- other	 Routes to/from bus stops not accomr Steps restricting access for all users; 					
	- Confusing layout for pedestrians creater	ating severance issues for users.				
DIRECTNESS				10		
17.SAFETY - traffic volume	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	2		
	traffic volumes.	, , ,	traffic.			
18.SAFETY	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		
	traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved	traffic.	_		
- traffic speed	uscog visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2		
19.SAFETY						
19.SAFETY - visibility						
19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY	,	,	Dranged keeps and to the control	6	Look of drop kerter at March	
19.SAFETY - visibility	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision.	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect.	0	Lack of drop kerbs at Martin Street, Tipping Street, narrow	
19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving			Lack of drop kerbs at Martin Street, Tipping Street, narrow drop kerbs at Cope street that have guillies. No tactile paving	
19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current			Street, Tipping Street, narrow drop kerbs at Cope street that	

Route Name	Eastgate Street
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	8
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	0
Total	30

Comments	Whilst the score is high this route lacks a significant amount of tactile paving and/or drop kerbs at side road crossings.
Actions	

	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS - maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.			
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).			
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			
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)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				0		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated				
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.			
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.			
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.			
B. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.			
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).			
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv				
COMFORT				0		
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.			
12.DIRECTNESS		Crossings partially diverting	Crossings deviate significantly from			
- location of crossings in	Crossings follow desire lines.	pedestrians away from desire lines.	desire lines.			
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled	Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).					
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	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s	pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to	desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay			
location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross butside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase	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 une yedstrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current.	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			
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	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	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:	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 pedestrain island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to			
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other	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 to from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users;	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:	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 pedestrain island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	0		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled - crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled - crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other - Controlled - Controlle	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 comforting to cross comforting the consecutive of the consecutive o	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:	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	0		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS .gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS .impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS .green man time 16.DIRECTNESS .other controlled crossings on Journey time 17.DIRECTNESS	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 furfrom bus stops not accommissing accommissing accommissing accommission and accommission of the commission of the comm	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 sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	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.	0		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY	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 tofrom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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. notude: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	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.	0		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility	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 comforts or the cores comforts. Examples of other directness issues: -Routes toffrom bus stops not accommosteps in all users; -Confusing layout for pedestrians creating accommost common to the common terms of the	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 sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.			
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other controlled crossings on journey time 17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY visibility SAFETY visibility SAFETY visibility	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 tofform bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	pedestrians 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: 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.	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.	0		
- 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) .ld.DIRECTNESS .impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS .green man time .green man time .ld.DIRECTNESS .other .ld.DIRECTNESS .dl.DIRECTNESS .dl.DIRECTNES	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 comforts or the cores comforts. Examples of other directness issues: -Routes toffrom bus stops not accommosteps in all users; -Confusing layout for pedestrians creating accommost common to the common terms of the	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. notude: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	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.			
- location of crossings in releation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic volume 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - concountry	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (c 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues: Routes to from bus stops not accome. Steps restricting access for all users; Confusing layout for pedestrians crass are all users; Confusing layout for pedestrians crass are ped stance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic seeds. Good visibility for all users.	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. notude: 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.	desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (+15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.			

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

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	
Comfort	
Directness	
Safety	
Coherence	
Total	

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
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		
I. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issues include: - Evidence that lighting is not present, or is deficient; - Temporary features affecting the attractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks), - Excessive use of guardar of bollards		2			
ATTRACTIVENESS				8		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated		2		
condition		(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.			
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.		N/A	
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	N/A	
B. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drive			Some A Boards present	
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.	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 of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2		
crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.		N/A	
crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS -impact of controlled crossings on journey time	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to		N/A	
trossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length	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: noodated;	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give			
incosing) [4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues in Routes fortion but scopes not accommodate and the sufficiency access for all users;	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: noodated;	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	0		
crossing) 14-DIRECTNESS -impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS -green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accommosteps - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crest - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	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: noodated;	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	0		
crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS 1-impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS 9 green man time 16.DIRECTNESS 0 ther DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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. noclude: noclude; to the period of t	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.	0 2	N/A	
indicate of the control of the contr	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues : - Routes to from bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cress the company of the company is confusionally a company of the	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. noclude: noclated; the pedestrian is users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	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. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	0 2 8 2	N/A	
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 visibility	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	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 notude: notated; Italians severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.	0 2 8 8 2 2	N/A	
crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS 1-impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS 15. DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY 17.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 19.SAFETY	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes toffrom bus stope not accorm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic soends. Good visibility for all users.	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; and the pedestrians in close proximity. 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.	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give volunerable 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.	0 2 8 2 2 2 2	N/A Traffic free	
crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS 1-impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS 15. DIRECTNESS 16. DIRECTNESS 16. DIRECTNESS 17. SAFETY 17. SAFETY 18. SAFETY 18. SAFETY 19. SAFETY 19. SAFETY 19. SAFETY 20. COHERENCE 16. ODHERENCE 16	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	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. noclude: noclated; the pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	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. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	0 2 8 2 2 2 2 6 6	N/A	
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 - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crail respective comments of the confusion of the comments of the	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; Italians exercises 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	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give uninerable 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.	0 2 8 2 2 2 2	N/A Traffic free	

Route Name	Crabberry St
Length	100m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	09 July 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	7
Directness	8
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	31

Comments	Street within vehicle restricted area (access for loading only). Level surface on all footway/carriageway areas.
Actions	None

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
. ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	1		
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/lantisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	1	Blank frontage on buildings, not overlooked, unattractive.	
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	2		
traffic noise and pollution A ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attra	les include: or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)		1	Edge of twon centre - car parks dominate the street. Some empty units, no	
ATTRACTIVENESS	- Excessive use of guardrail or bollards			5	benchjes to sit.	
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated	Large number of footway crossovers			
o. Comfort	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.	Large minute in tolowly dussovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2		
s. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
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		
3. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2	parking restrictions on roadside.	
9. COMFORT gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers/gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance width Poorly drained footways resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces		1			
COMFORT				11		
11.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	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 butside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2	Very quiet road, easy to cross	
14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	0	N/A	
15. DIRECTNESS green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	extended green man time but current	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	0	N/A	
16.DIRECTNESS other	time unlikely to deter users. cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues include: Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; Steps restricting access for all users; Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.		with the state of	0	N/A	
DIRECTNESS				6		
17.SAFETY	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	2		
I8.SAFETY	traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians	Traffic speeds moderate and	traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians	2		
traffic speed	can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2		
visibility	Total In Colors	but unlikely to result in collisions.	collisions.			
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	Level surface	
paving						
paving COHERENCE			Total Score	30		

Route Name	Mount St
Length	200m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	09 July 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	11
Directness	6
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	30

Comments	Street within vehicle restricted area (access for loading only). Level surface on all footway/carriageway areas.
Actions	None

- maintenance signific 2. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime appropriate appropriat	icant issues noted. vidence of vandalism with optiate natural surveillance. ic noise and pollution do not t the attractiveness inples of 'other' attractiveness issue affecting is not present, opporary features affecting the attraces sesive use of guardrail or bollards ways level and in good condition, no trip hazards. It give and take between users king on roads. way with generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. withing on roads. withing on roads. say withing generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. withing on roads. say withing enerally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. say withing on proads. say and take between users king on roads. say and take between users king on roads. say withing on proads. say and take between users king on roads. say between users king on roads.	could be improved es include in set include or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks is section of set of	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or freeted powerners, or sprifficant uneven patching or trenching. 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. 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. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	A boards outside shops and pub	
fear of crime appropriate for a propriate for	priate natural surveillance. Ic noise and pollution do not the attractiveness inples of 'other' attractiveness issue fance that lighting is not present, reporary features affecting the attreassive use of guardrail or bollards sessive use of guardrail or bollards ways level and in good condition, no trip hazards. It give and take' between users liking on roads. way widths generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take' between users liking on roads. Widths generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take' between users liking on roads. Widths generally sess of and take between users liking on roads. Widths generally sess of 2m to accommodate heart give in the commodate heart give in the commodate heart give in the commodate and the commodate of 2m to accommodate and the commodate of 2m to accommodate and the commodate of 2m to accommodate of 2m	frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street). Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved ses include: or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks). Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as caracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in tips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in unew surface. Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. 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 destre lines. Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate). Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching. 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. 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. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to give and take frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to give and take frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to give and take frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2 2 2 2	A boards outside shops and pub	
traffic noise and pollution affect to traffic noise and pollution affect to the content of the c	the attractiveness isour density of the control of	could be improved es include in set include or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks is section of set of	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching. 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. 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. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2 2 2	A boards outside shops and pub	
Example of the control of the contro	notes of other attractiveness isourcess of the control of the cont	es include: es include: or is deficient; cativeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks) Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in tips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in unevn surface. Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking, causes some deviation from desire lines. Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). Lude: arrance width for pedestrians (e.g. drivarance width for pedes	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pawent, or significant uneven patching or trenching. 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. 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. 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 delare lines. Gradeints exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2 2 1	A boards outside shops and pub	
other - Evide - Temp - Excel - Temp - Excel - Temp - Excel - E	dence that lighting is not present, opporary features affecting the attra- essive use of guardral or bollards ways level and in good condition, to trip hazards. to accommodate all users ut give and take between users liking on roads. way widths generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users liking on roads. way widths generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users liking on roads. Widths generally to accommodate in accommodate in the properties of the properties the properties of the properties the properties of the properties the propertie	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks is Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely for result in tips or difficulty for wheelchais; prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface. Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between users and walking on coads. Clearance widths between deproximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking, causes some deviation from desire lines. Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). Liude:	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or freeted powerners, or sprifficant uneven patching or trenching. 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. 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. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2 2 1	A boards outside shops and pub	
5. COMFORT condition 5. COMFORT with no condition 6. COMFORT without condition condition 7. COMFORT without condition condi	to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. way width generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. Widths generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. Widths generally ses of 2m to accommodate li-chair users. stances of vehicles parking on ays noted. Clearance widths rally in excess of 2m between anent obstructions. ples of 'other' comfort issues inci poprary obstructions restricting de firers/glaste restricting access; and	(such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in tips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in unevn surface. Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for give and take walking on roads. Clearance widths between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between users and walking on roads due to footway parking, course some deviation from desire lines. Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). Liude:	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or freited pawerin, or significant uneven patching or trenching. Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited flootway width requires users to give and take frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2 2 1	A boards outside shops and pub	
condition with no condition with no company with no company with a condition of the context of t	to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. way width generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. Widths generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take between users king on roads. Widths generally ses of 2m to accommodate li-chair users. stances of vehicles parking on ays noted. Clearance widths rally in excess of 2m between anent obstructions. ples of 'other' comfort issues inci poprary obstructions restricting de firers/glaste restricting access; and	(such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in tips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in unevn surface. Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for give and take walking on roads. Clearance widths between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between users and walking on roads due to footway parking, course some deviation from desire lines. Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). Liude:	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or freited pawerin, or significant uneven patching or trenching. Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited flootway width requires users to give and take frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	1	A boards outside shops and pub	
footway width without control of the	ut give and take' between users king on roads. Widths generally in excess of to accommodate all users ut give and take' between users king on roads. Widths generally less of 2m to accommodate let-chair users. Stances of vehicles parking on ayas noted. Clearance widths rally in excess of 2m between anent obstructions. Be are no slopes on footway. Topies of 'other' comfort issues incliporary obstructions restricting defensivglasser restricting cleres/gates restricting access; and	approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. Clearance widths between sers and walking on roads. 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 destre lines. Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). Liude: arrance width for pedestrians (e.g. driva	standard wheelchair width). Limited tortoway with requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. 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. 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. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	1	A boards outside shops and pub	
width on staggered crossings/ in exceptions is and s/refuges wheelestrian is an analysis of s/refuges wheelestrian is an analys	ut give and take between users kiking on roads. Widths generally pess of 2m to accommodate I-ichair users. Istances of vehicles parking on ayays noted. Clearance widths rally in excess of 2m between anent obstructions. Be are no slopes on footway. Inplies of 'other' comfort issues inclipporary obstructions restricting clerics/glaste restricting access; and	1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads. 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. Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. 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. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2	pub	
footway parking footway parking general general general general foother for the football general gener	ays noted. Clearance widths rally in excess of 2m between anent obstructions. e are no slopes on footway. sples of 'other' comfort issues inclingorary obstructions restricting de- refers/glaste restricting access; and	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. Stopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). ude: arrance width for pedestrians (e.g. drivs	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. Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).			
gradient 0.COMFORT - Temp - Barrit - Bus s - Poorl	nples of 'other' comfort issues incl nporary obstructions restricting cle riers/gates restricting access; and	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12). lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drive	12).	2		
10.COMFORT Examp - other Barri - Bus - Poorl COMFORT	nporary obstructions restricting cle riers/gates restricting access; and	lude: earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drive				
	Examples of 'other' control issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers/gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance width. - Poorly drained tootways resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces					
				9		
footway provision pedest	ways are provided to cater for strian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS Crossi location of crossings in relation to desire lines		lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2		
13.DIRECTNESS Crossi	sing of road easy, direct, and ortable and without delay (< 5s age).	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		
impact of controlled crossings on journey time		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		
green man time to cros		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		
other - Route - Steps	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: - Routes form bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
DIRECTNESS				10		
traffic volume can ke	volumes.	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2		
traffic speed can ke	ic speeds low, or pedestrians keep distance from moderate c speeds.	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2		
visibility	d 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		
- dropped kerbs and tactile paving paving		Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current standards.	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect.	0	One set of tactile paving to junction with Malt Mill Lane. However flush paving has no edge marking for visially impared users	
COHERENCE				0		
			Total Score	31		

Route Name	Salter Street (retail area)
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	9
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	0
Total	31

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
I. ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	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/lantisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	1	No active frontage	
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	2		
traffic noise and pollution ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	es include:	arano noto			
other	Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attri- Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				5		
5. COMFORT - condition	Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	1	Some poor surfacing ajacent to informal parking	
5. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	1	Less than 2m for the majority of the length. Wide carriageway that is now one way.	
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	Informal parking to rear of shop blocks footway completely.	
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	Temporary obstructions restricting cle Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wice	Examples of 'other' confroit issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers'gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance width - Bus shelters restricting clearance width				
COMFORT				7		
11.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
I2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2		
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2		
14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	2		
15. DIRECTNESS green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2		
16.DIRECTNESS · other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: Routes formor bus stops not accommodated; Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.					
	Commonly wyout for personaling obtaining obtaining isolated for USB15.			10		
DIRECTNESS			15.1.4	2		
17.SAFETY	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.			
17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate		unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	2		
17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians	pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.			
DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in	2		
17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users. Adequate dropped kerb and tacille	pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in	2		
17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users. Adequate dropped kerb and tacille	padestrians 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	unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions. Dropped kerbs and tactille paving	2		

Route Name	Salter Street (from North Walls)
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	7
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	0
Total	20

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
. ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	1		
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	Blank frontage on buildings, not overlooked, unattractive.	
B. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2		
I. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attra	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)		1	some empty units, away from main 'hub' of activity	
ATTRACTIVENESS	- Excessive use of guardrail or bollards			6		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated	Large number of footway crossovers	2		
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.	-		
s. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	1	some narrow sections due to location of street furniture	
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		
3. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
O. 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. drivi		0		
COMFORT				9		
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
I2.DIRECTNESS I 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	Indirect crossing at Broad Eye but other crossing is very direct and on desire line.	
I3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings or resent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2	Very quiet road, easy to cross	
I4.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.	en man time is of sufficient length oss comfortably. Green man time would not give extended green man time but current vulnerable users sufficient time to time unlikely to deter users cross comfortably.		0	No signalised crossing	
6.DIRECTNESS other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.		0	N/A		
DIRECTNESS				7		
7.SAFETY traffic volume	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2		
8.SAFETY traffic speed	Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	2		
9.SAFETY	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.	6		
SAFETY						
SAFETY 20. COHERENCE dropped kerbs and tactile paying	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.		Link to Chapel st is not great	
<u> </u>		provided, albeit not to current		1 29	Link to Chapel st is not great	

Route Name	Broad St
Length	150m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	09 July 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	9
Directness	7
Safety	6
Coherence	1
Total	29

Comments	Functionally OK but unattractive street.
Actions	None

	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
. ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street fumiture falling into major disrepair.	1		
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		
. 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	Just off the inner ring road with high levels of traffiic adjacent to narrow footways.	
I. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issues include: - Evidence that lighting is not present, or is deficient; - Temporary features affecting the attractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks) Excessive use of guardrail or bollards					
ATTRACTIVENESS				3		
5. COMFORT - condition	Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in rips 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		
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 narrow footways over bridge with close passing vehicles especially HGVs	
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		
3. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers/gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance width Poorty driande flootwayer resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces					
			aces			
COMFORT			aces	7		
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Poorly drained footways resulting in r Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	noticeable ponding issues/slippery surf- Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
I1.DIRECTNESS footway provision I2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines	Poorly drained footways resulting in I Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2		
ILDIRECTNESS footway provision ILDIRECTNESS Location of crossings in elation to desire lines ILDIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross sutside of controlled	Poorly drained footways resulting in r 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. Crossings deviate significantly from	2	No crossing facility at roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more desirable route.	
11.DIRECTNESS footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross sutside of controlled crossing) 4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled impact of controlled	Poorly drained footways resulting in I 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 (c. 5s.)	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	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	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
11.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS in elation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings resent or if likely to cross utside of controlled crossings on journey time impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time	- Poorly drained footways resulting in I 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 (e. 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. 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 55 in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in	2 2 0	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
ILDIRECTNESS footway provision ILDIRECTNESS Location of crossings in relation to desire lines ILDIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings or resent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) LADIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time IS. DIRECTNESS green man time IS. DIRECTNESS	Poorly drained footways resulting in I 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). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings froad direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give unlerable users sufficient time to	2 2 0	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
ILDIRECTNESS footway provision ILDIRECTNESS Location of crossings in elation to desire lines ILDIRECTNESS ILDIRECTNESS ILDIRECTNESS ILDIRECTNESS INTERPROVED CONTROLL INTERPROVED INTERPRO	- Poorly drained footways resulting in re- Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings for oad 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 accommissing access for all users; - Stops restricting access for all users; - Stops restricting access for all users; - Stops restricting access for all users;	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings froad direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give unlerable users sufficient time to	2 2 0	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
I1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS Location of crossings in elation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings resent or if likely to cross utside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15.DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other	- Poorly drained footways resulting in I Footways are provided to cater for podestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (e. 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings froad direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (-15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 0 0 2 2 2	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
ILDIRECTNESS footway provision IZDIRECTNESS Location of crossings in elation to desire lines IJDIRECTNESS IJDIRECTNESS IJDIRECTNESS IJDIRECTNESS INTERPROVED INTE	- Poorly drained footways resulting in it Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (c. 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues. - Routes to/from bus stops not accom- 5 lieps restricting access for all users, - Confusing layout for pedestrians creat Traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian slicely to wait >5s in pedestrian slicely to wait >5s in pedestrian slicely to deter users. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.	2 2 2 2 3 8 8 0 1 1	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
I1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS Location of crossings in elation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings or resent or if likely to cross suiside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other 17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY visibility	- Poorly drained footways resulting in I Footways are provided to cater for podestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (e. 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait 5-5s in pedestrian slicely to wait 5-5s in pedestrian steady as the pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	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.	2 2 0 2 2 2 3 8 8 0 0	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
I1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS Location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings or resent or if likely to cross suside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other 17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY visibility SAFETY	- Poorly drained footways resulting in it Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users, - Confusing layout for pedestrians cra - Confusing layout for pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volume. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island: Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: noclated; traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (-15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian sile. 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. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 0 2 2 2 2 8 8 0 0	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
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 - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 117.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	- Poorly drained footways resulting in it Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comforably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes bufform bus stops not accome - Stops restricting access for all users Confusing layout for pedestrians crei Traffic speeds. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Good visibility for all users.	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. 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: noodated; titing 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.	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 2 0 2 2 2 3 8 8 0 0	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	
I1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings or controlled crossings or controlled crossings) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE dropped kerbs and tactile	- Poorly drained footways resulting in it Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comforably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes bufform bus stops not accome - Stops restricting access for all users Confusing layout for pedestrians crei Traffic speeds. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Good visibility for all users.	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. 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: 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	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. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2 2 0 2 2 2 2 8 8 0 0	roundabout and pedestrian crossing a long way off-line. Hoever, it does link with the much more attartice riverside walk which would be the more	

Route Name	Broad Eye
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey/Amber Kenyon/Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	3
Comfort	7
Directness	8
Safety	2
Coherence	1
Total	21

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
I. ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	1	Overgron vegetation in border adjacent to roundabout with Tenterbanks	
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	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 with high volume of traffic and noise	
I. 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)).		Bins to side of properties on Broad Eye.	
ATTRACTIVENESS				2		
5. COMFORT - condition	Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	1	Some uneveness in narrow footway location, Braod Eye to and through bus stops.	
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	A pinch point at the bus stops.	
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		
B. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT · gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drivi I				
COMFORT				8		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	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).	0	45 second delay at pedestrian crossing opposite Sainsbury's. It was also noted how busy this crossing was and at times more pedestrians were seen crossing than cars wating.	
14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	0		
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accomr - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating steps.	modated;				
DIRECTNESS	- m	7.00	W. J. C.	6		
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. Good visibility for all users.	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in	1	This score is for the service	
19.SAFETY - visibility	visibility for all USERS.	but unlikely to result in collisions.	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.		area to Iceland where visibility is poor and it is expected there will be HGV movements	
SAFETY				1		
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.	0		
paving						
paving COHERENCE			Total Score	17		

Route Name	Chell Road
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey/Amber Kenyon/Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	2
Comfort	8
Directness	6
Safety	1
Coherence	0
Total	17

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS - maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/lantisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
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	1		
traffic noise and pollution I. ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	es include:	arano noto	1	Parked cars overlap footway	
other	Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attri- Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).		at Almshouses	
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		
5. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	1	some narrow sections due to location of street furniture, e.g. bollards in centre of desire line	
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	n/a	
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.	0	n/a	
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. drivi		1		
COMFORT				6		
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2		
relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	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.	0	N/A	
5. DIRECTNESS green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	0	N/A	
16.DIRECTNESS other	Imme unlikely to deter users. cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues include: Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; Steps restricting access for all users; Confusing layout for pedestrians creating severance issues for users.			0	N/A	
DIRECTNESS				6		
7.SAFETY traffic volume	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2		
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		
SAFEII	A descriptor described to the send describe	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	2		
	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile					
20. COHERENCE dropped kerbs and tactile paying		provided, albeit not to current standards.	absent or incorrect.			
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving COHERENCE		provided, albeit not to current	absent or incorrect.	2		

Route Name	Earl St
Length	250m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	09 July 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	6
Directness	6
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	26

	General arrangement of street is satisfactory for pedestrians, some minoir issues such as position of bollards and cars on footway by Almshouses
Actions	None recommended

4 4770 4070/51/500	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
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)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated	Large number of footway crossovers	2		
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 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
7. COMFORT - width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
8. COMFORT - footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT - gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv				
COMFORT				10		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
	to road).	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	pedestriair desire lines.			
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.		Dropped kerbs on one side	
- 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	to road).	lines. Crossings partially diverting	Crossings deviate significantly from		Dropped kerbs on one side	
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	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s	lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to	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.	1	Dropped kerbs on one side	
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	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase	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.	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 pedestrain island. Green man time would not give unlerable users sufficient time to	2	Dropped kerbs on one side	
location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length	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.	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	Dropped kerbs on one side	
I 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 crossing on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS .green man time 16.DIRECTNESS .other	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 accommon stops recommendations.	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.	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 pedestrain island. Green man time would not give unlerable users sufficient time to	2	Dropped kerbs on one side	
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other - Controlled - Contr	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (c 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comforting to cross comforting to cross comforting access for all users; - Routes to from bus stops not accome. Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating the common cross comforting access for all users; - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians creating access an kep distance from moderate	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.	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	2 2	Dropped kerbs on one side	
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other	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 forfrom bus stops not accome. Stops restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crassing a case for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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 sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	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.	2 2 9 9	Dropped kerbs on one side	
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic volume 19.SAFETY	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 tofform bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	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 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Dropped kerbs on one side	
relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (c 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues: Routes to/from bus stops not accomediate to/from bus stops no	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 sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.	2 2 2 9 9 2 2	Dropped kerbs on one side	
- 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) - traffic controlled crossings on journey time - the controlled	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users, - Confusing layout for pedestrians cra keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic soeeds. Good visibility for all users.	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: noolated; title geverance 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.	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 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 6		
- 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) - traffic controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes forfrom bus stops not accommended to the commendation of the com	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: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved	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 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 6 0	Dropped kerbs on one side	
- location of crossings in releation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic volume 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - do COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes forfrom bus stops not accommended to the commendation of the com	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: notated, the pedestrians in classes of the pedestrians in classes. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (+15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 6		

Route Name	Water Street
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Amber Kenyon
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	
Comfort	10
Directness	
Safety	
Coherence	
Total	3

Comments	
Actions	

	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	1		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	1	Lots of parking	
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)).	2		
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated	Large number of footway crossovers	1	Car park entrance	
condition		(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.			
s. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
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		
B. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT - gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv		2		
COMFORT				11		
11.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for		Footways are not provided to cater for			
rooting providen	pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in		to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.		2		
12.DIRECTNESS I location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross butside of controlled	to road).	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting	pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from	2	Crossing over roundabout	
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	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s	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	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.	2	Crossing over roundabout	
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 crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. 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.	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	pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in	1	Crossing over roundabout	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. 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 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: nonclude: nonclude: noncladed.	pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	1	Crossing over roundabout	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time	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 I-Routes toffrom bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users;	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: nonclude: nonclude: noncladed.	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	2 2 2	Crossing over roundabout	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross busisde of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15.DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. 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 comforth or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comforth or zebra crossings. Famples of 'other' directness issues in Routes to from bus stops not accommon to the common stops of the common stops of all users; Confusing layout for pedestrians crossing layout for pedestrians	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: nonclude: nonclude: noncladed.	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	2 2 2	Crossing over roundabout	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 14.DIRECTNESS 15.DIRECTNESS 15.DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 17.DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY	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 i- Routes forfrom bus stops not accomens. Stops restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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: notidated; the pedestrians in the content of the pedestrians in the content of the pedestrians in the content of the pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	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.	2 2 2 11	Crossing over roundabout	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY	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 tofform bus stops not accomr - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crast and the position of the programment of the progr	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: nodated; this pedestrian is considered to the pedestrians would be somewhat impredictions and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved.	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 2 2 11 1	Crossing over roundabout	
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)	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comforts or cross comforts or cross comforts. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comforts or sufficient length to cross comforts or sufficient length to cross comforts or sufficient length or cross comforts or sufficient length to cross comforts or sufficient length or cross sufficient length or cross sufficient length or cross sufficient length or sufficient lengt	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing for cand 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: notidated; the pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.	2 2 2 11 1 1 2 2 2	Crossing over roundabout	
12.DIRECTNESS -location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS -gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS -impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS -green man time 16.DIRECTNESS -other DIRECTNESS -other 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes toffrom bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crack the commoderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic soeeds. Good visibility for all users.	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 2-5s 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 proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	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 podestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 2 2 11 1 1 2 2 2 5 5		
12.DIRECTNESS -location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS -gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings) present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS -impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS -green man time 16.DIRECTNESS -other DIRECTNESS 11.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes forfrom bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	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: nodated; this pedestrian is considered to the pedestrians would be somewhat impredictions and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved.	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 2 2 2 2 11 1 2 2 5 0	Crossing over roundabout Crossing at carpark	
12.DIRECTNESS -location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other 16.DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY -traffic volume 19.SAFETY -traffic speed 19.SAFETY -visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE -dropped kerbs and tactile	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes forfrom bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	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 2-5s in pedestrian sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: Inclu	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 2 2 2 11 1 1 2 2 2 5 5		

Route Name	Tenterbanks
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Amber Kenyon
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	11
Directness	11
Safety	5
Coherence	0
Total	33

Comments	
Actions	

	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS - maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS - fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attra - Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				6		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated		2		
- condition		(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.			
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 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	Next to and opposite pub	
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	Loading vehicles on double yellow 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).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv			Bins reducing width	
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.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2		
relation to desire lines						
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled	Crossing 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		
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled	comfortable and without delay (< 5s 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 island.	or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	2		
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	comfortable and without delay (< 5s 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 island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current	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			
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	confortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length	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: notidated;	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		
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other	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 i - Routes toffrom bus stops not accomm - 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 island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: notidated;	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	2		
13.DIRECTNESS -gaps in traffic (Where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS -impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS -green man time 16.DIRECTNESS -other	comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross confortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes tofrom bus stope not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cress the conformation of the conformation	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: notidated;	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	2		
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) - to controlled crossing) - to controlled crossing) - to controlled crossings on journey time - to controlled cross	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 i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras can keep 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 sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: nodated; time governance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	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	2 2		
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) - Italian controlled crossings on journey time - Italian controlled crossings on journey	comforable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comforably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes tofform bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crest and the confusion of the confusion o	associated with some delay (up to 15 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 proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved.	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 2 10 2 2		
gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossings resent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossings on journey time 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	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 i - Routes to/from bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crest - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep 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. Include: nodated; titling severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.	2 2 10 2 2		
13.DIRECTNESS -gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS -impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS -green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY	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 tofform bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras the control of the cont	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 proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	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. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 10 2 2 2 2		
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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 i - Routes tofrom bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crest access to a step of the company of	associated with some delay (up to 15 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 proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved.	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 2 10 2 2		
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) - traffic controlled crossing) - traffic controlled crossing on journey time - traffic controlled crossings on journey time - traffic present of the controlled crossing on journey time - traffic controlled crossings on journey time - traffic present of the controlled crossings on journey time - traffic present of the controlled crossings on journey time - traffic represent on the controlled crossing of the controlled crossing on the controlled crossing of the	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 i - Routes tofrom bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crest access to a step of the company of	associated with some delay (up to 15 average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >55 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 proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions. Dropped kerbs and tactle 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 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 2 10 2 2 2 2		

Route Name	Mill Bank
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Amber Kenyon
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	
Comfort	
Directness	1
Safety	
Coherence	
Total	3

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
B. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2		
I. 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)).	0		
ATTRACTIVENESS	•			6		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated		2		
condition		(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.			
s. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	1	Level shared surface but adjacent parking may be a difficulty for some wheelchair users and double buggies.	
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	not applicable	
3. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
O. 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		
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.	2		
I3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2		
crossing) 4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	0	not applicable	
erossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to		not applicable	
A DIRECTNESS 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length	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: nodated;	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give			
crossing) (A-DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time) 15. DIRECTNESS green man time (6.DIRECTNESS other	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues in Routes fortion but scopes not accommodate and the sufficiency access for all users;	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: nodated;	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	0		
impact of controlled crossings on journey time lb. DIRECTNESS green man time lb.DIRECTNESS other controlled crossings on journey time lb.DIRECTNESS other controlled crossings of the lb.DIRECTNESS other controlled crossings of the lb.DIRECTNESS lb.DIRECTNESS lb.DIRECTNESS lb.DIRECTNESS	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accome - Stops restricting access for all views - Confusing layout for pedestrians crest - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	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: nodated;	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	0		
Incosing) (I-DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time of the controlled crossings on journey time of the controlled crossing controlled crossing controlled co	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomn - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic podes low, or pedestrians	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. noclude: noclude; to the period of t	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.	0	not applicable	
incosing) (I-DIRECTNESS Impact of controlled crossings on journey time I5. DIRECTNESS green man time I6.DIRECTNESS other DIRECTNESS IT.SAFETY traffic volume I8.SAFETY traffic speed	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues : - Routes to from bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cress the company of the company is confusionally a company of the	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended geen man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: nodated; atting 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.	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. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	0 0 6 2 2	not applicable low traffic street within managed area	
impact of controlled crossings on journey time (14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time (15. DIRECTNESS green man time (16.DIRECTNESS other controlled cont	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	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. neclude: nodated; times are severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.	0 0 6 2 2 2	not applicable low traffic street within managed area	
individual 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 visibility SAFETY	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes toffrom bus stope not accorm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic soends. Good visibility for all users.	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; title geverance 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.	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give volunerable 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.	0 0 6 2 2 2 2 6 6	not applicable low traffic street within managed area	
crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS 1-impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS 15. DIRECTNESS 16. DIRECTNESS 16. DIRECTNESS 17. SAFETY 17. SAFETY 18. SAFETY 18. SAFETY 19. SAFETY 19. SAFETY 19. SAFETY 20. COHERENCE 16. ODHERENCE 16	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended geen man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: nodated; atting 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.	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. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	0 0 6 2 2 2	not applicable low traffic street within managed area	
15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16. DIRECTNESS other 16. DIRECTNESS other 17. SAFETY traffic volume 18. SAFETY traffic speed 19. SAFETY visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crail respective common time in the confusion of the common time in the common time	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; titing 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	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.	0 0 6 2 2 2 2 6 6	not applicable low traffic street within managed area	

Route Name	Mill Street
Length	approx 200m
Name of Assessor(s)	Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	10 July 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	
Comfort	
Directness	
Safety	
Coherence	
Total	2

Comments	Historic strreet with active retail frontages and some marked parking bay. Access-only street with one-way operation for motor traffic.
Actions	No improvements suggested.

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS - maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS - fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS	Traffic noise and pollution 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	es include:	arano noto			
- other	 Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attra- Excessive use of guardrail or bollards 	activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				5		
5. COMFORT		Some defects noted, typically isolated		1	Poor carriageway surfacing at	
- 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.		crossing outside of station	
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	1.4m and 0.98 pinch point at bus stops	
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	Narrow refuge in centre if cannot cross in time.	
8. COMFORT - footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT - gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drive				
COMFORT				7		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	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).	1		
14.DIRECTNESS	Crossings are single phase	Crossings are staggered but do not	Staggered crossings add significantly	2		
- impact of controlled crossings on journey time	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	_		
crossings on journey time	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to		Green man time is sufficient however significant wait time for green man.	
crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length	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. nclude: nodated;	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give		Green man time is sufficient however significant wait time for green man.	
crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users;	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. nclude: nodated;	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to		however significant wait time	
trossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes forfrom bus stops not accome - Stops restricting access for all views - Confusing layout for pedestrians crest Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	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. nclude: nodated;	to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	1	however significant wait time	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16. DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17. SAFETY - traffic volume 18. SAFETY	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 cress Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	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. notude: nodated; titing severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and	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 unable to keep their distance from	1	however significant wait time	
15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16. DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17. SAFETY - traffic volume 18. SAFETY - traffic speed 19. SAFETY	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accorm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creating to the company of the confusion of the company	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. neclude: nodated; timg severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	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.	8 1	however significant wait time	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16. DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accorm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	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: nodated; atting 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.	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. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in	8 1	however significant wait time	
15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16. DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17. SAFETY - traffic volume 18. SAFETY - traffic speed 19. SAFETY - visibility	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes toffrom bus stops not accorn - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	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: nodated; atting 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.	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. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in	8 1 2	however significant wait time	
15. DIRECTNESS -green man time 16. DIRECTNESS - other 16. DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17. SAFETY - traffic volume 18. SAFETY - traffic speed 19. SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes toffrom bus stops not accorn - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	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; title governance 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	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.	8 8 1 2 2	however significant wait time	

Route Name	Victoria Road/Station Road
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey/Amber Kenyon/Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	•

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	7
Directness	8
Safety	5
Coherence	2
Total	27

Comments	
Actions	

1. ATTRACTIVENESS	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
- maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS - fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	1		
4. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issues include: - Evidence that lighting is not present, or is deficient; - Temporary features affecting the attractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks) Excessive use of guardrail or bollards					
ATTRACTIVENESS				5		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated		2		
- condition		(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 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
7. COMFORT - width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
8. COMFORT - footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT - gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. driv				
COMFORT				10		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent	Footway provision could be improved	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
	to road).	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	pedestrian desire lines.	-		
- location of crossings in	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2		
- 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		lines. Crossings partially diverting	Crossings deviate significantly from			
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 follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	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.	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.	2		
- 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	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.	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.	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 pedestrain island. Green man time would not give unlerable users sufficient time to	2		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	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	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.	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		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other	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 i - Routes toffrom bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users;	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.	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 pedestrain island. Green man time would not give unlerable users sufficient time to	2		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS	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 forfrom bus stops not accommentable sufficient length or cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes forfrom bus stops not accommentable sufficient length or cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes forfrom bus stops not accommentable sufficient length or cross-commentation cross-commentatio	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.	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	2 2 2 2		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other	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 i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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. Unalkely to wait >5s in pedestrian sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	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.	2 2 2 2 10		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - other 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY	Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelicaripuffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues in a common subsequence of the directness issues in a common subsequence of confusing layout for pedestrians cress can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved speedstrians in close proximity.	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 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
- location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility	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 i - Routes to/from bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	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 sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
- 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) - Land Controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - visibility SAFETY	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 i - Routes furmor bus stops not accorm - Sleps restricting access for all users, - Confusing layout for pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic soeeds. Good visibility for all users.	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: noolated; title geverance 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.	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 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
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 - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	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 i - Routes toffrom bus stops not accommonstable to the composition of the compos	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: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved speedstrians in close proximity.	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 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
- 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 - other DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic volume 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - visibility SAFETY - 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile - dropped kerbs - dropped kerb	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 i - Routes toffrom bus stops not accommonstable to the composition of the compos	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: notated, the pedestrians in classes of the pedestrians in classes. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (+15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		

Route Name	Bridge Street
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Amber Kenyon
Date of Assessment	•

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	10
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	33

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
I. ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	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 pollution 4. ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu	es include:				
- other	Evidence that lighting is not present, Temporary features affecting the attri- Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	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.	2		
8. COMFORT - footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT - gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues include: - Temporary obstructions restricting clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. driveway gates opened into footway); - Barriers/gates restricting access; and - Bus shelters restricting clearance width Poorly drained footways resulting in noticeable ponding issues/slippery surfaces					
COMFORT				10		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	1	location is at the end of the road and not on the alignment for the majority of users who want to access the town centre	
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	1	Steady flows of traffic to the car parks can inhibit crossing on desire line where no refuge is present.	
14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	2		
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2		
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues include: - Routes to/from bus stops not accommodated; - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing Buyut 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	Steady flows of vehilces accessing the carpark	
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	20mph zone but feels faster	
19.SAFETY - visibility	Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.		2		
SAFETY				4		
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		
CONERCIOL						

Route Name	South Walls
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	
Comfort	10
Directness	3
Safety	4
Coherence	
Total	20

Comments	
Actions	

	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS - maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2		
2. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2		
3. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	1	Busy a road with high traffic flows	
I. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness issu - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the attra - Excessive use of guardrail or bollards	or is deficient; activeness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks)).			
ATTRACTIVENESS				5		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated		2		
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 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	A noarrow section of shared use footway/ ctcleway adjacent to car dealership is constrained by guard rail	
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.	0	Footway parking at Domino's Pizza causes obstruction plus vehicles reverse across remaining footway width. The same was moted at Bathroom shop where no bollards are located.	
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. driv				
COMFORT				2		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for	Footway provision could be improved	Footways are not provided to cater for			
	pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	pedestrian desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in	to road). Crossings follow desire lines.	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2		
12.DIRECTNESS I location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross butside of controlled	to road).	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting	pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from	2	Score of 2 as controlled crossing mitigate against high vehicle flows	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in leatant to desire lines (13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings oresent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) (14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled impact of controlled	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s	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	pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay	2	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings oresent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. 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.	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 3-5s in pedestrian	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	2	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. 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 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: nonclude: nonclude: noncladed.	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 wulnerable users sufficient time to	2 2	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	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 I-Routes toffrom bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users;	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: nonclude: nonclude: noncladed.	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 wulnerable users sufficient time to	2 2	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross busisde of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15.DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other	to road). Crossings follow desire lines. 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 comforting to cross comforting to cross comforting to cross comforting society of the common state	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: nonclude: nonclude: noncladed.	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	2 2 1 1	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 13.DIRECTNESS 14.DIRECTNESS 15.DIRECTNESS 15.DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 17.DIRECTNESS 16.DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY 18.SAFETY 18.SAFETY	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 i- Routes forfrom bus stops not accomens. Stops restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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: notidated; the pedestrians in the content of the pedestrians in the content of the pedestrians in the content of the pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	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.	2 2 1 1 1	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS green man time 16.DIRECTNESS other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY	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 tofform bus stops not accomr - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	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. notudes: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved visibility could be somewhat improved visibility could be somewhat improved.	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 wilnerable 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 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffir or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues in Routes forfrom bus stops not accommended to the commendation of the comme	to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing for cand 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: notidated; the pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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.	2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS -location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS -gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS -impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS -green man time 16.DIRECTNESS -other DIRECTNESS -other 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes toffrom bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crack the commoderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic soeeds. Good visibility for all users.	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 2-5s 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 proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	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 wilnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 4 4	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS - agas in traffic (where no controlled crossings) present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS - green man time 16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 11.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes forfrom bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	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. notudes: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved visibility could be somewhat improved visibility could be somewhat improved.	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 wilnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	crossing mitigate against high	
12.DIRECTNESS -location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS -goals in traffic (where no controlled crossings) present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS -impact of controlled crossings on journey time 15. DIRECTNESS -green man time 16.DIRECTNESS -other DIRECTNESS -traffic volume 18.SAFETY -traffic volume 19.SAFETY -visibility SAFETY -visibility SAFETY -20. COHERENCE -dropped kerbs and tactile	to road. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues i - Routes forfrom bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cras keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	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 2-5s in pedestrian sland. Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: Inclu	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. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 4 4	crossing mitigate against high	

Route Name	Newport Road
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Edward Healey/Amber Kenyon/Adrian Lord
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	
Comfort	
Directness	
Safety	
Coherence	
Total	2

Comments	
Actions	

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	0		
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	Alley	
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)				
ATTRACTIVENESS				3		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good condition,	Some defects noted, typically isolated		0		
- 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 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
7. COMFORT - width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2		
8. COMFORT - footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2		
9. COMFORT - gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2		
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; and Bus shelters restricting clearance wid 	earance width for pedestrians (e.g. drive				
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.	0		
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 is of sufficient length	Pedestrians would benefit from	Green man time would not give	2		
- green man time	to cross comfortably.	extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.			
	to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues i - Routes to/from bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians creations.	time unlikely to deter users. nclude: nodated;	vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.			
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accomr - Steps restricting access for all users;	time unlikely to deter users. nclude: nodated;		8		
16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accomr - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crei Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	time unlikely to deter users. nclude: nodated;	cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	8 2		
16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY	Examples of other directness issues - Routes bufrom bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	time unlikely to deter users. notate: nodated; titing severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians			
16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY	Examples of 'other' directness issues: - Routes tofrom bus stops not accome - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians cres Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volume.	time unlikely to deter users. nodude: nodated; titing 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	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	2	Coming out of top	
16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility	Examples of other directness issues - Routes bufrom bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	time unlikely to deter users. notude: nodated; titing severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	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	Coming out of top	
16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY	Examples of other directness issues - Routes toftom bus stops not accom- Steps restricting access for all users; - Conflusing layout for pedestrians cres Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	time unlikely to deter users. notude: nodated; titing 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.	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 2 1 5	Coming out of top	
16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Examples of other directness issues - Routes bufform bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic Seeds Good visibility for all users. Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	time unlikely to deter users. nodude: nodated; titing 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	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	2 2 1 5 0	Coming out of top	
16.DIRECTNESS - other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed 19.SAFETY - visibility SAFETY 20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile	Examples of other directness issues - Routes bufform bus stops not accomm - Steps restricting access for all users; - Confusing layout for pedestrians crea - Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic Seeds Good visibility for all users. Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	time unlikely to deter users. nodated; titing 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	cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions. Dropped kerbs and tactille paving	2 2 1 5	Coming out of top	

Route Name	Friars Road/Friars Walk
Length	
Name of Assessor(s)	Amber Kenyon
Date of Assessment	

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	3
Comfort	8
Directness	8
Safety	5
Coherence	0
Total	24

Comments	
Actions	