

# 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.

### Summary

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

### Further Information

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

### Acknowledgement

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

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

### Walking Route Audit Tool

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
<b>1. ATTRACTIVENESS - maintenance</b>	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.			
<b>2. ATTRACTIVENESS - fear of crime</b>	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).			
<b>3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and pollution</b>	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			
<b>4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other</b>	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					
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>0</b>		
<b>5. COMFORT - condition</b>	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.			
<b>6. COMFORT - footway width</b>	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.			
<b>7. COMFORT - width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges</b>	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>8. COMFORT - footway parking</b>	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.			
<b>9. COMFORT - gradient</b>	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).			

<b>10.COMFORT - other</b>	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					
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>0</b>		
<b>11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision</b>	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.			
<b>12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines</b>	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.			
<b>13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)</b>	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).			
<b>14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time</b>	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.			
<b>15. DIRECTNESS - green man time</b>	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.			
<b>16.DIRECTNESS - other</b>	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.					
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>0</b>		
<b>17.SAFETY - traffic volume</b>	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.			
<b>18.SAFETY - traffic speed</b>	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.			
<b>19.SAFETY - visibility</b>	Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.			
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>0</b>		
<b>20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving</b>	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.			
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>0</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>0</b>		

## ROUTE SUMMARY

<b>Route Name</b>	Horninglow Street
<b>Length</b>	340 metres
<b>Name of Assessor(s)</b>	James Lowe
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	Friday, August 09, 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	#REF!
Comfort	0
Directness	0
Safety	0
Coherence	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Actions</b>	

