

APPENDIX F – WALKING ROUTE AUDITS

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool

Walking Route Audit Tool

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS - 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 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				0		
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.			
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.			
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.			
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.			
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	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				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 - 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.			
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).			
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.			
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.			
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				0	
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.		
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.		
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.		
SAFETY				0	
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision.	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current standards.	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect.		
COHERENCE				0	
Total Score				0	

ROUTE SUMMARY

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

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	0
Comfort	0
Directness	0
Safety	0
Coherence	0
Total	0

Comments	
Actions	

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Oxford Road (Howard Street to Argyle Street)
Length	636m
Name of Assessor(s)	Helen Stimpfig, Tom Holcroft, Lucy Prismall, Rob Curtis, Chris Sperring, Emma Baker, Rebecca Brooks
Date of Assessment	01 March 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	4
Comfort	8
Directness	7
Safety	4
Coherence	1
Total	24

Comments	Average of each team's results. Score of less than 70% - interventions required to bring route up to standard.
Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove unnecessary bollards / guardrail. Target any pavement trip hazards. Improve street maintenance to reduce litter. Ensure tactile paving is present and at a good standard. Explore the relocation of Argyle Street Crossing. Explore the option to lengthen Bedford Road green man phase.

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Oxford Road (Argyle Street to Cranbury Road)
Length	660m
Name of Assessor(s)	Tom Holcroft, Emma Baker, Chris Sperring
Date of Assessment	01 March 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	4
Comfort	8
Directness	12
Safety	3
Coherence	2
Total	29

Comments	As above. Result of 73% - this route has achieved just over the minimum recommended score.
Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove Beresford Road pinch point. Replace defected tactile paving.

Route Name	Oxford Road (Cranbury Road to Beecham Road)
Length	600m
Name of Assessor(s)	Rachel O'Boyle, Lucy Prismall, Rebecca Brooks
Date of Assessment	01 March 2019

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

Comments	As above. Score of less than 70% - interventions required to bring route up to standard.
-----------------	---

Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove unnecessary bollards / guardrail. • Improve street maintenance to reduce litter - bins next to bus stops. • Ensure tactile paving is present and at a good standard. • Improve the Wantage Road crossing - move within pedestrian desire line. • Explore bus stop relocation.
----------------	--

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Oxford Road (Cranbury Road to Beecham Road)
Length	643m
Name of Assessor(s)	Helen Stimpfig, Rob Curtis
Date of Assessment	01 March 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	7
Directness	8
Safety	3
Coherence	0
Total	24

Comments	Route varies - the route improves further west.
-----------------	---

Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove unnecessary bollards / guardrail. • Ensure tactile paving is present and kerbs are dropped/flushed. • Address pedestrian delay at Groveland Road crossing. • Address pinch points - this will be helped with the removal of unnecessary bollards.
----------------	---

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	University to Reading Town Centre - Christchurch Road
Length	730m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	9
Directness	8
Safety	3
Coherence	0
Total	26

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	University to Reading Town Centre - Southampton Street
Length	900m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	8
Directness	9
Safety	4
Coherence	1
Total	28

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	University to Reading Town Centre - Bridge St to Broad St
Length	250m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	12
Directness	11
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	38

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	University to Town Centre - Redlands Road
Length	1km
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	8
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	0
Total	31

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	University to Town Centre - Addison Road and Craven Road
Length	660m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	9
Directness	12
Safety	6
Coherence	0
Total	35

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	University to Town Centre - London Road
Length	630m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	11
Directness	9
Safety	4
Coherence	2
Total	32

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	University to Town Centre - London St to Broad St
Length	660m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15 October 2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	8
Directness	8
Safety	5
Coherence	2
Total	29

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Castle Street - Bath Road / Berkerly Avenue Junction
Length	1500m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	9
Directness	7
Safety	4
Coherence	0
Total	27

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Bath Road / Berkeley Avenue Junction - Bath Road / Honey End Lane Mini Roundabout
Length	1600m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	10
Directness	7
Safety	4
Coherence	0
Total	26

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 4: Wokingham Road
Length	1800m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	10
Directness	7
Safety	4
Coherence	0
Total	28

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 4: Wokingham Road Kings Street to Kings Road
Length	770m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	10
Directness	7
Safety	4
Coherence	0
Total	28

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 4: Broad Street
Length	360m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	11
Directness	12
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	39

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 4: Oxford Road
Length	250m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	10
Directness	9
Safety	3
Coherence	2
Total	31

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 5: Part 1A Broad St to Reading Station
Length	300m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	11
Directness	9
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	33

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 5: Part 1B St Marys Butts to Caversham Road
Length	400m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	10
Directness	11
Safety	5
Coherence	2
Total	33

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 5: Part 2A Underpass Reading Station to Vastern Road
Length	400m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	8
Safety	5
Coherence	2
Total	31

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 5: Part 2B Caversham Road
Length	600m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	3
Comfort	7
Directness	9
Safety	2
Coherence	1
Total	22

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 5: Part 3 Vastern Road
Length	250m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	8
Directness	8
Safety	4
Coherence	1
Total	28

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 5: Part 4 Caversham Road
Length	360m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	9
Directness	10
Safety	2
Coherence	1
Total	28

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 5: Part 5 Caversham Bridge
Length	300m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	7
Directness	9
Safety	4
Coherence	0
Total	26

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 5: Part 6 Church St to Prospect St
Length	560m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	8
Directness	10
Safety	4
Coherence	1
Total	30

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit

ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Route 6: Part 7 Peppard Road
Length	2000m
Name of Assessor(s)	Ellen Few and Andrew Lovegrove
Date of Assessment	15.10.2019

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	8
Directness	9
Safety	4
Coherence	0
Total	27

Comments	Detailed in Audit
Actions	Detailed in Audit