



# Canterbury Local Plan Evidence Vol 1 - Sustainable Transport Strategy

Policy N1 - Merton Park, Canterbury

22-022-013 Rev D

October 2025

# Document Control Sheet

Project Name:	Policy N1 - Merton Park, Canterbury
Project Number:	22-022
Report Title:	Canterbury Local Plan Evidence Vol 1 - Sustainable Transport Strategy
Report Number:	013

Rev	Issue Purpose	Author	Checked	Reviewed	Approved	Date
-	Local Plan	CG	JW	CG	JW	03/06/24
A	Local Plan	CG	CG	JW	JW	07/02/25
B	Local Plan	CG	CG	CG	JW	11/03/25
C	Local Plan	CG	CG	CG	JW	10/07/25
D	Local Plan Focused Consultation	CG	JW	CG	JW	21/10/25

**C&A Consulting Engineers**

Park House, Park Farm  
 East Malling Trust Estate  
 Bradbourne Lane  
 Aylesford, Kent  
 ME20 6SN  
 Tel: 01732 448120

Landmark House  
 Station Road  
 Hook  
 Hampshire  
 RG27 9HA  
 Tel: 01256 630420

enquiries@c-a.uk.com



## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Overview .....	4
1.2	Report Purpose .....	5
1.3	The City's Tale .....	6
1.4	Why 'Vision-Led'? .....	11
1.5	Accessibility v Mobility.....	12
<b>2</b>	<b>Policy Context .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	National Policy .....	13
2.2	Kent Policy .....	13
2.3	Canterbury District Policy.....	14
2.4	Mountfield Park Application .....	18
2.5	Summary.....	20
<b>3</b>	<b>Site Location Context .....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1	Overview .....	21
3.2	Active Travel Routes .....	21
3.3	Public Transport Services .....	30
3.4	Summary.....	34
<b>4</b>	<b>Mobility Demand Context .....</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1	Overview .....	35
4.2	Source Demand Data .....	36
4.3	Criteria for Assumed Potential Sustainable Travel.....	37
4.4	Maximum Potential for Sustainable Travel .....	41
4.5	Implications for Infrastructure Planning.....	42
<b>5</b>	<b>Transport Vision.....</b>	<b>44</b>
5.1	The Vision .....	44
5.2	Precedents for Aspirational Sustainable Living.....	45
<b>6</b>	<b>Interventions for Promoting Active Travel.....</b>	<b>48</b>
6.1	Introduction .....	48
6.2	Draft Policy.....	48
6.3	On-Site Connections.....	49
6.4	Off-Site Connections.....	51
6.5	Other Measures .....	65

<b>7</b>	<b>Measures to Promote Public Transport .....</b>	<b>66</b>
7.1	Introduction .....	66
7.2	Draft Policy.....	66
7.3	Initial Improvements.....	67
7.4	Longer Term Transport Innovation .....	68
<b>8</b>	<b>Managing Residual Vehicle Trips .....</b>	<b>70</b>
8.1	Overview .....	70
8.2	Parking and Electric Vehicles .....	70
8.3	Off-Site Parking Matters.....	71
8.4	Car Club.....	72
8.5	Monitor and Manage .....	72
<b>9</b>	<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>KCC Guidance on Planning Applications</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>Existing Sustainable Travel Networks</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>Active Travel Audit</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b>Modal Share Summary</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Appendix E</b>	<b>Site Access Gateways</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Appendix F</b>	<b>Active Travel Improvements</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Appendix G</b>	<b>Overall Bus Strategy</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Appendix H</b>	<b>Parking Surveys</b>	<b>84</b>

# 1 Introduction


## 1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 C&A have been appointed by Quinn Estates to provide transport and highways support for their site promotion activities associated with the emerging Canterbury City Council Local Plan (2040). This is Volume 1 of the evidence and should be read alongside Volume 2 – Traffic Impact Assessment.
- 1.1.2 In 2025 CCC carried out a Regulation 18 consultation on the Local Plan (2040) which included the neighbouring sites C6 “Merton Park” and C7 “Land north of Hollow Lane”, both being promoted by Quinn Estates as a combined sustainable urban extension to Canterbury. It had been anticipated that CCC would move latterly to Regulation 19 stage and as part of this, the promoter had been actively engaged with both CCC and Kent County Council (KCC) in the preparation of transport evidence to support those draft allocations. However, in the summary of 2025 CCC instead reverted to Regulation 18 stage with a ‘focused consultation’ on a revised Local Plan strategy. This retained Merton Park, now referred to as Policy N1, but removed the Land north of Hollow Lane site. This change in strategy is understood to have been informed by concerns raised by KCC Highways – in particular with respect to perceived concerns regarding residual traffic impact when considered alongside the draft CCC Transport Strategy.
- 1.1.3 In this context, this report demonstrates the evidence for continuing allocation of Policy N1, but accompanying representations<sup>1</sup> show that there are opportunities for further sustainable development by reinstating the Land North of Hollow Lane site within the Local Plan strategy.
- 1.1.4 The latest draft Policy N1 is for approximately 1,930 dwellings, community facilities and associated transport services on a site between the A2 Dover Road and the Old Dover Road as illustrated below.

---

<sup>1</sup> C&A reports 22-022-015 and 22-022-016

Figure 1.1 – Site N1 (Merton Park) Concept Masterplan



## 1.2 Report Purpose

- 1.2.1 This document sets out the vision for how people will travel to, from and within the site and the measures to make this travel as sustainable as possible. It focuses on the specifics of the Sustainable Transport Strategy for Site N1, and a similar strategy has been produced for the adjacent Hollow Lane site.
- 1.2.2 This document starts by setting out the context in which development of Site N1 would come forward - considering the policy, location and anticipated travel demand context. In the latter case this sustainable travel strategy seeks to adopt an evidence-led approach and therefore seeks to quantifiably assess the travel demand context using a contemporary approach to allow forecasting of aspirational mode split (and thus residual car trip rates) that can be plausibly anticipated as outcomes from the vision-led approach to this transport strategy.

- 1.2.3 Given the contemporary nature of the approach adopted, this report sets out the methodology applied to quantify the travel demand and importantly, provides initial outcomes from this exercise in the form of forecast potential patronage for non-car modes of travel, developed from the appraisal of overall demand on a route-by-route basis. This outcome, discussed in section 4 of this report, represents a critical component of this vision-led approach to forecasting. Through robust evidence it is demonstrated that the exceptional locational characteristics of Site N1 are such that a significant majority of conventionally forecast car-based trips generated by a development could take place by alternative, active and sustainable modes of transport, even when reasonable and recognised limitations of such modes are acknowledged and accounted for. This also reflects engagement between C&A and KCC Highways over the past year to refine sustainable transport proposals for the site.
- 1.2.4 These outcomes should not be confused with forecasts or predictions of what is anticipated to happen. However, they do provide incredibly valuable insights into the potential for change and importantly this evidence has been prepared in a manner that allows disaggregation by routes/destinations.
- 1.2.5 This report goes on to set out a 'vision' for the site-specific sustainable transport strategy. In doing so in the previously established context of the demonstrable and significant opportunities, the vision maximises the opportunity for positive, but plausible outcomes. This might be contrasted with a vision simply developed in an otherwise generic policy context and is appropriate for the site-specific strategy such as this.
- 1.2.6 Section 6 and 7 of this report go on to provide tangible and deliverable measures and interventions to be implemented pursuant to realisation of the development vision for sustainable transport, considering active and public transport services.
- 1.2.7 Acknowledging that not all sustainable travel is necessarily non-car; section 8 presents measures to maximise the opportunities for the anticipated residual vehicle-based demand to be managed in the most sustainable manner (such as by promoting increased vehicle occupancy, use of electric vehicles etc.).

### **1.3 The City's Tale**

- 1.3.1 Sustainable development has been broadly defined by the United Nations as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."
- 1.3.2 In the UK context, the 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the allocation process should prioritise development in sustainable locations:

109 - Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve:

- a) making transport considerations an important part of early engagement with local communities;
- b) ensuring patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places;
- c) understanding and addressing the potential impacts of development on transport networks;
- d) realising opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;
- e) identifying and pursuing opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use; and
- f) identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains.

110 - The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health.

- 1.3.3 The draft Local Plan settlement hierarchy recognises Canterbury itself as the largest and most sustainable settlement in the District.
- 1.3.4 Canterbury has been a settlement for at least 2,000 years and for much of this time, its residents would have walked for everyday travel needs.
- 1.3.5 More recently the Victorian era saw the widespread adoption of bicycles and railways, but also some development outside the historic walled centre (including the southern areas close to Merton Park) which would presumably have been considered walkable as shown below.

Figure 1.1: Map of Canterbury circa 1890<sup>2</sup>

1.3.6 It is only in the last 50 years that motor vehicles have become a dominant transport mode in the city, which is reflected in the construction of the Ring Road in the 1960s and the A2 western bypass of the city in the 1980s.

1.3.7 Today, Canterbury and development in its immediate proximity is well placed to maximise sustainable travel for a number of reasons below, most of which are identified explicitly in the draft Local Plan:

- Three universities and the potential to grow knowledge-based, high-wage sectors in the local economy;
- A walkable city centre with limited access for motor vehicles and well-established Park and Ride provision;
- Distinctive historic townscape which generates tourism and provides an attractive environment for its residents;
- Some of the highest levels of sustainable travel in Kent, with around 50% of residents in the city centre already commuting by sustainable modes;
- Good connectivity to neighbouring towns and Greater London, which enables residents to commute out of the city if they need to;

<sup>2</sup> Image credit: Ordnance Survey / National Libraries of Scotland

- Residents with progressive politics and awareness of environmental issues.

**Figure 1.2: Car-free townscape in central Canterbury<sup>3</sup>**




- 1.3.8 Data has been extracted from the 2011 Census for how residents travel to work. While people also travel for other purposes, this is a good proxy for overall trends as the majority of adults are in work and commuting typically accounts for the majority of trips in peak periods when transport networks are often more constrained.
- 1.3.9 The summary below shows that in the areas in and around Site N1 , the majority of residents already use sustainable modes to travel to work. This compares to 29% using sustainable modes across the Canterbury district (including some more rural areas) and 31% for the whole of England.

---

<sup>3</sup> Image credit: Wikimedia Commons

Figure 1.3: Modal share around Merton Park



1.3.10 In the 2022 iteration of the draft Local Plan, CCC promoted a “Canterbury Circulation Plan” (CCP) to further promote active travel and significantly limit private vehicle movements. While the specific infrastructure proposals of the CCP are no longer being pursued, the latest draft of the Local Plan retains a strong focus on sustainable transport modes<sup>4</sup>: In summarising the main proposals in the Regulation 18 draft plan on their website, CCC stated that it is supported by:

*“a transport strategy that now focuses on better bus services as well as the promotion of walking and cycling to help to persuade people to leave their cars at home, rather than building additional road capacity”*

1.3.11 This is supported by the draft Local Plan itself, which at end of page 3 notes:

*“The revised draft plan now responds to the concerns raised by our communities by shifting the emphasis of the transport strategy away from road building and towards a public transport-led approach, advocated by national policy.”*

<sup>4</sup> CCC <https://news.canterbury.gov.uk/consultations/canterbury-district-local-plan-to-2040/>

1.3.12 This sustainable transport strategy sets out the outcomes the development and wider community seek to achieve in terms of movement and access to, from and within the development. It sets the aims and objectives against which the transport solutions are to be developed and delivered.

## 1.4 Why 'Vision-Led'?

1.4.1 Historically, development and infrastructure planning has endeavoured to predict the anticipated outcome of development, using historical trends and patterns, and thereafter provide interventions to support those predictions. This approach has failed. It was based on an unjustified confidence in the predictability of the future, lacking cognisance of an increasingly uncertain outlook – and it has failed to acknowledge the propensity for the provision of such interventions to facilitate and encourage those predicted outcomes, which are often unwanted.

1.4.2 A 'Vision-led' approach represents a new paradigm. It asks the question 'what do we, as a community, want?' and goes on to provide the infrastructure and means to achieve that – maximising the opportunity to realise those outcomes. Again, this document sets out to provide the answer to the question of what 'we' want, grounding that in the prevailing local and national policy context, as well as other current and emerging challenges.


1.4.3 The context for this 'vision-led' approach to development can be found in the recent Government publications, including the DfT's 'Decarbonising Transport: A Better, Green Britain' (2021); the updated NPPF and the DfT Circular 01/2022 'The Strategic Road Network and Delivery of Sustainable Development'.

1.4.4 In addition to embracing the principles of vision-led development, they provide clarity on what outcomes decision makers should strive for. Sustainable development has been a theme of UK planning for over two decades; but as the NPPF continues to explain, there is a multi-faceted basis for striving for more sustainable development, including but not limited to working within environmental constraints. More recently, the environmental need for sustainable development has becoming more important still, with the legally binding objective of achieving Net Zero carbon emissions, to tackle the climate change agenda. In short, achieving sustainably accessible development is no longer simply desirable or preferable – it is essential.

1.4.5 These objectives will never be achieved by continuing to build development which depends on road building which simply perpetuates historical trends. Put simply – development must ensure that people need to travel less and when they do need travel, it should be over the shortest distances possible and by the most sustainable and healthy travel modes.

## 1.5 Accessibility v Mobility

- 1.5.1 Taking forward that objective and as will be clear from this vision document, contrast is drawn between sustainable 'mobility'; the means by which people move; and sustainable 'accessibility', which is a broader topic that embraces access to services that do not necessarily involve movement.



Lyons, G. and Davidson, C. (2016). Guidance for transport planning and policymaking in the face of an uncertain future. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 88, 104-116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2016.03.012>

- 1.5.2 The diagram above illustrates the 'Triple Access System', representing the world we live in. Mobility, the process of physical movement through the transport system plays only one part in the axis of factors that influence accessibility. Historically, accessibility has been principally defined by the means and modes by which we move – leading to a focus on interventions to the transport system to facilitate or, optimistically to encourage, sustainable travel. All too often the result of this focus has been on highway network interventions and facilitating the anticipated demand in the manner that minimises severity of residual impact.
- 1.5.3 As will be evident from this vision document; this development will embrace all facets of the triple access system to maximise the outcomes.

## 2 Policy Context

### 2.1 National Policy

- 2.1.1 As shown in the previous chapter, the NPPF gives clear support for active travel modes. More recently this has been boosted by the 2023 establishment of Active Travel England (ATE) to “achieve a step-change in walking, wheeling and cycling”. ATE are a statutory consultee on major planning applications to ensure that opportunities for active travel are fully exploited, and this document has been prepared in line with ATE guidance.
- 2.1.2 DfT Circular 01/2022 states that a TA “should start with a vision of what the development is seeking to achieve and then test a set of scenarios to determine the optimum design and transport infrastructure to realise this vision.” On this basis, the vision for the Merton Park development seeks strong active travel and public transport connections so that the development is well-integrated with Canterbury as a whole.
- 2.1.3 The CIHT issued guidance on the likely uptake of active travel modes. *Planning for Walking* guidance reports that approximately 80% of journeys shorter than 1 mile (1.6km) are made wholly on foot. Similarly, *Planning for Cycling* guidance reports that majority of the cycling trips made are for short distances, with 80% being less than five miles (8km) and with 40% being less than two miles (3.2km).

### 2.2 Kent Policy

- 2.2.1 Kent County Council adopted Local Transport Plan 4 in 2016. While this predates some of the recent advances in national policy with respect to transport and travel, it notes the existing congestion in Canterbury but without recommending further road building:

*Canterbury is a medieval city with a historic and constrained road network so congestion in the peaks is a regular occurrence and the four level crossings cause further delays.*

...

*There is a need to prioritise active travel and public transport use in relation to the private car, making best use of the existing infrastructure.*

- 2.2.2 In March 2023, KCC circulated a paper to the CCC Joint Transportation Board (included in **Appendix A**) which states:

*KCC Highways seek to promote sustainable travel options above that of the private car to offer a mode choice whenever possible.*

...

*KCC Highways, where possible, are not now looking to amend the network to accommodate more cars. Instead, they are looking to see how people could travel more sustainably from new development sites and are asking developers to provide the infrastructure to make this happen. This is known as “Vision and validate” or “decide and provide” as opposed to the former use of “predict and provide” which always looked at the worst-case future year scenario and tried to adjust the network to cope with it. The hope is that in the future it will be more inviting and easier to walk and cycle short trips than to use the private car and that public transport will be more accessible with reliable journey times.*

- 2.2.3 Since this document was first written, KCC have also produced a Cycling and Walking Action Plan. This includes a package of improvements in the Canterbury Walking Zone and four cycling corridors: Canterbury - Aylesham – Dover, Canterbury – Hawkinge – Folkestone Canterbury – Wingham – Sandwich and Canterbury - Birchington.

## **2.3 Canterbury District Policy**

- 2.3.1 The adopted 2017 Canterbury Local Plan includes the following policy.

### *Policy T1 Transport Strategy*

*In considering the location of new development, or the relocation of existing activities, the Council will always take account of the following principles of the Transport Strategy:*

- a. Controlling the level and environmental impact of vehicular traffic including air quality;*
- b. Providing alternative modes of transport to the car by extending provision for pedestrians, cyclists and the use of public transport;*
- c. Reducing cross-town traffic movements in the historic centre of Canterbury;*
- d. Providing public car parking and controlling parking having regard to the Parking Strategy;*
- e. Assessing development proposals in the light of transport demands and the scope for choice between transport modes; and*
- f. Seeking the construction of new roads and/or junction improvements which will improve environmental conditions and/or contribute towards the economic well-being of the District.*

*5.22 In support of Policy T1, this plan proposes a hierarchy of transport modes. They will be considered in the following order: walking, cycling, public transport, park and ride, private car.*

*5.26 Canterbury's urban areas are particularly suited to walking being mainly flat and compact and as such the potential to shift journeys currently made by car to walking is extremely high which would help in reducing peak hour congestion. One example of this is the Riverside pedestrian and cycle routes through the City.*

- 2.3.2 The emerging Local Plan builds on these themes and includes the following transport-related documents as part of the evidence base.


***Draft Canterbury District Transport Strategy (CDTS)***

- 2.3.3 The draft CDTS provides high-level ideas for how the Local Plan growth can come forward in a way that supports decarbonisation and sustainable travel. It sets out a hierarchy of transport modes in which active travel is prioritised, followed by public transport (including emerging technologies), and lastly the use of private vehicles.
- 2.3.4 For active travel, the CDTS states that "Active travel includes walking and cycling and is the most efficient way of travelling short distances bringing health benefits and not impacting on air quality or climate change", and notes the benefits of electric cycles for longer journeys.
- 2.3.5 The CDTS notes that major roads around the city centre act as a barrier to active travel, particularly the Ring Road roundabouts as shown in the example below. These roundabouts mostly have underpasses which are unwelcoming to pedestrians and do not allow cyclists; these are proposed to be replaced with traffic signal layouts which can incorporate at-grade pedestrian and cycle crossings.

**Figure 2.1: A28 Wincheap Roundabout with no formal active travel provision**



Figure 2.2: CDTS Overview Map



2.3.6 Some corridors have been identified in more detail in the accompanying Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which is discussed separately below.

2.3.7 In relation to public transport, buses will be “a key pillar of the local transport network” building on the growth in bus patronage during the 2010s. More specific proposals are given in the accompanying Bus Strategy which is also discussed below. The CDTS also identifies improvements at both of the railway stations in Canterbury including 12-car platform extensions and a new entrance at West station, and a new entrance to East station from Gordon Road.

#### ***Draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)***

2.3.8 The LCWIP aims to develop “a coherent network for everyday safe and convenient walking and cycling that promotes the modal hierarchy and identifies and delivers enhancements.” In support of this aim, the document has identified a series of routes around the District and the existing shortcomings; each route also has an estimated cost and proposed funding source.

Figure 2.3: LCWIP Proposals – Wincheap / South West




Figure 2.4: LCWIP Proposals – South of City



### ***Draft Bus Strategy***

- 2.3.9 The Bus Strategy notes that Canterbury District already has some well-used bus routes including those linking the “big three” settlements of Canterbury, Whitstable and Herne Bay. However, some services are limited in evenings and Sundays, resulting in a service which does not provide a comprehensive offer to residents. The Strategy has an “ambitious but achievable” target to increase bus mode share across the district from 4.9% in 2011 to 7.0% by the 2040 end year of the Local Plan.
- 2.3.10 The Bus Strategy also summarises the infrastructure schemes proposed in Canterbury. This includes the “Fast Bus” route linked to the Mountfield Park development which is discussed further below.

### **Figure 2.5: Summary of bus infrastructure schemes**

Table 4.1: Proposed transport infrastructure schemes relevant to bus

Canterbury
Proposed schemes
<b>Wincheap:</b> Proposed eastbound contraflow bus lane (between Hollow Lane and Simmonds Road)
<b>New Dover Road (at St Lawrence Road):</b> Bus priority measure associated with South Canterbury development (no detail)
<b>Sturry Road:</b> Proposed extension to existing bus lane between Starle Close and Tourtel Road; Proposed extension to bus lane Vauxhall Road to South Street
<b>Nunnery Fields/South Canterbury Road/New fastbus route</b> from Mountfield Park to South Canterbury crossing B2068 and continuing to city centre on carriageway around Kent and Canterbury Hospital crossing B2068: Proposed fastbus on existing highway

## **2.4 Mountfield Park Application**

- 2.4.1 Mountfield Park is immediately east of the Merton Park site. It was included in the 2017 adopted Local Plan and later submitted as a planning application<sup>5</sup>; CCC approved the application in summer 2023 with the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.
- 2.4.2 As for the proposals for Site N1 , the Mountfield Park development includes a wide range of interventions to support sustainable transport, most notably the Fast Bus scheme, with a ‘monitor and manage’ approach to assess the effectiveness of these interventions.

### ***S106 Fastbus Scheme***

- 2.4.3 The agreed S106 outlines the conditions relating to the construction and monitoring and management of the Fast Bus and overall bus commitments that the development is bound to.

<sup>5</sup> CCC ref CA/16/00600

2.4.4 These are provided in summary below:

*More than 1000 units cannot be occupied until approval of:*

- a) the outline details of an agreed route for the Fastbus Site 10 Link*
- b) details of the Fastbus On Site Link*
- c) particulars of the Fastbus Traffic Signal Junction; and*
- d) indication of the Traffic Regulation Orders that would be required to be in place to facilitate construction of the Fastbus Site 10 Link*

2.4.5 In addition to this, it is stated that more than 1499 units should not be occupied until the Fastbus Traffic Regulation Order contribution has been paid to the County Council, and more than 1599 units should not be occupied until the Fastbus Onsite Link, the Fastbus Site 10 Link and the Fastbus Traffic Signal Junction have been constructed and are operational and subject to agreements in relation to future maintenance.

2.4.6 In relation to the Alternative Bus Scheme, the S106 states that:

*On occupation of 1200 dwellings, if the County Council is unable to grant rights for the Fastbus Site 10 Link to be lawfully constructed, then the developer will need to deliver the Fastbus Site 10 link in accordance with an alternative programme as set out below:*

- a) Occupation should not exceed 1,300 units unless an alternative Fastbus Link scheme has been submitted and approved.*
- b) To implement the alternative Fastbus Link Scheme in accordance with details approved by the council.*

#### **Section 106 Bus Agreement**

2.4.7 In addition to the Fastbus Scheme, the Mountfield Park development is also subject to terms in relation to an Interim and Final Bus Agreement at various stages of development. The terms of the agreement are as follows:

- a) More than 600 units should not be occupied until the Interim Bus Agreement has been entered into to be ready to implement by the 700<sup>th</sup> occupation.*
- b) To comply with the interim bus agreement until the Final Bus Agreement has been entered into.*
- c) Not to occupy more than 1500 units until the Final Bus Agreement has been entered into to ensure the Final Bus Service is implemented by occupation of the 1600<sup>th</sup> unit.*
- d) To comply with the Final Bus Agreement until Completion of the development.*

## 2.5 Summary

- 2.5.1 The above policies and planning context clearly establish that a range of sustainable transport modes, and in particular active travel modes, should be provided for large-scale development sites. The historic approach of 'predicting and providing' for private vehicle trips has been relegated in favour of more energy and space efficient modes.

### 3 Site Location Context

#### 3.1 Overview

- 3.1.1 The Merton Park site is well-placed to benefit from the three strands of accessibility as described earlier.
- 3.1.2 In relation to **physical mobility**, Canterbury already has a sustainable travel culture as shown in section 1. The physical connections are explored in this section.
- 3.1.3 The site benefits from **spatial proximity** to Canterbury City centre which has a wide range of employment, education, retail and leisure destinations for everyday life. The site is also very close to the Kent and Canterbury Hospital which is a major employer in the city.
- 3.1.4 For **digital connectivity**, the advent of superfast broadband enables many service sector workers to work at home for part or all of the week and thus reduce their peak-time travel. There are further opportunities to secure quality digital-based services which will reduce both the need for residents to travel and the need for vehicle trips to support daily activities.

#### 3.2 Active Travel Routes

- 3.2.1 “Active travel” broadly refers to human-powered modes of transport including walking, cycling, scooting and wheelchair travel - these modes combine the health benefits of movement with a minimal per-journey cost to the user. With appropriate and attractive provision, these modes of transport will become the natural choice for shorter journeys.
- 3.2.2 CIHT guidance<sup>6</sup> reports that approximately 80% of journeys shorter than 1 mile (1.6km) are made wholly on foot. Similarly, the majority of cycling trips are over relatively short distances, with 80% being less than five miles (8km) and with 40% being less than two miles (3.2km).
- 3.2.3 Most roads in Canterbury have footways and street lighting, with crossings at major roads, allowing walking or wheeling for everyday travel. There are also some designated on-road or traffic-free cycle routes as shown below and in the “Explore Kent” map in **Appendix B**.

---

<sup>6</sup> CIHT Planning for Walking and Planning for Cycling, 2015

**Figure 3.1: Signed cycle route between the city centre and University of Kent**




- 3.2.4 Much of the city has evolved over hundreds of years without a formal planning or design process, so C&A have audited existing sustainable transport corridors using the DfT Walking Route Audit Tool (WRAT)<sup>7</sup> as shown in **Appendix C**. This method examines the attractiveness, comfort, directness, safety and coherence.
- 3.2.5 This audit has focused on key corridors towards everyday destinations which residents could reach via active modes; this leads on to identified effective upgrades later in this report.

### *Wincheap*

- 3.2.6 Wincheap is a suburban area along the A28 corridor southwest of the city centre. It will be a significant trip attractor for Merton Park residents including a range of foodstore and other retail, a gym, brewery taproom and employment in the industrial estate.

**Figure 3.2: Range of retail, employment and leisure uses in Wincheap**



<sup>7</sup> DfT <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plans-technical-guidance-and-tools>

- 3.2.7 While some customers undoubtedly use cars to access the larger retailers, it will remain possible for Merton Park residents to use active travel for top-up food shopping, commuting to jobs or accessing leisure facilities in Wincheap.
- 3.2.8 The routes from Merton Park to these areas are fairly direct and run mostly away from the main motor traffic routes. However, some footways on Hollow Lane and Cow Lane are cracked or uneven which could dissuade pedestrian use. In addition, the staggered crossing of the A28 (from Hollow Lane to Cow Lane) is a key desire line which has no controlled facilities for pedestrians or cyclists.

**Figure 3.3: Cow Lane**



- 3.2.9 Biggleswade Passage is another route towards the A28 corridor which lacks surveillance or lighting, which again would deter pedestrian use. However Victoria Road is an all-purpose road running parallel which does include footways and street lighting and this would be a more attractive route.

#### ***East station***

- 3.2.10 East station is within walking distance of much of Merton Park, located just outside the Ring Road en-route to the city centre.

- 3.2.11 There is an access on the 'near side' of the station from Gordon Road, but it is poorly signposted and so users may not be aware that this exists, instead taking a longer route to the main entrance on the 'far side'. The surface here is also in poor condition.

**Figure 3.4: Canterbury East Rear Access to Platform 1**



### ***City Centre***

- 3.2.12 Central Canterbury draws people from East Kent and further afield for retail, employment, education, leisure and cultural opportunities and it is the dominant retail centre in East Kent.<sup>8</sup> The West railway station is on the northwest edge of the centre. Part of the city centre is within walking distance of the site and all of the centre is within cycling distance. Canterbury Academy and the University of Kent campus are accessed via onward routes and fall within cycling distance.
- 3.2.13 Stuppington Lane west of the old railway bridge currently has no footways or lighting, although this is to be expected as it currently runs through mostly open land. The section through the existing residential area does have footways and lighting.

<sup>8</sup> GL Hearn - Canterbury City Council Retail and Leisure Study 2020

**Figure 3.5: Stuppington Lane leading north – rural context**



**Figure 3.6: Stuppington Lane leading north – residential context**



- 3.2.14 Moving north, South Canterbury Road and Nunnery Fields form a signed and lit walking and cycling route towards the city centre. There are no crossings at the Stuppington Lane/South Canterbury Road junction and Nunnery Fields has a pinch point with reduced footways at the railway bridge.


- 3.2.15 At the north end of Nunnery Fields, users would either turn left onto Old Dover Road or continue across to Oaten Hill/Dover Street where traffic volumes are moderate. However shortly thereafter users need to either cross the busy Ring Road or take a longer orbital route along the Ring Road. As identified in the draft Transport Strategy, the high traffic volumes and poor-quality crossings create significant severance here.

**Figure 3.7: Upper Bridge Street Pedestrian Crossing to Town Centre**



- 3.2.16 Once inside the city walls there is a generally low traffic environment with good quality surfacing, street lighting and wayfinding signage.
- 3.2.17 There is an onward signed route to the University of Kent campus which uses quiet streets and traffic-free paths, although this takes in a significant gradient on the final section as shown below.

Figure 3.8: Cycling route from Merton Park to University of Kent



### Abbey Area

- 3.2.18 The area east of the city centre around St Augustine's Abbey includes the Canterbury Christ Church University and University for the Creative Arts campuses, further secondary schools, City Council offices and other public services.
- 3.2.19 Active travel routes to this area are generally good, although the environment is compromised by refuse sacks and other obstructions. Some uneven paving was observed on Upper Chantry Lane, and the junction with A257 New Dover Road requires pedestrians to cross in several stages rather than directly. This junction does include north-south cycle lanes albeit on the carriageway with no protection from motor vehicles.

**Figure 3.9: Cycle Paths Upper Bridge Street**



3.2.20 Further northeast the environment around the former Barracks is of lower quality with some vandalism.

**Figure 3.10: Footpath to Rear of Barracks**



### ***South East Area***

- 3.2.21 To the east of the site, the Kent and Canterbury Hospital and the two Simon Langton schools will be significant destinations for residents' employment, education and healthcare needs.
- 3.2.22 The pedestrian environment on this corridor is generally good, although there are some uneven dropped kerbs and crossovers on Ethelbert Road.

**Figure 3.11: Ethelbert Road**



**Figure 3.12: Ethelbert Road Kerb**



- 3.2.23 The junction of Old Dover Road and Ethelbert Road has high traffic flows and no crossing facilities, which would impede pedestrian movements here.

- 3.2.24 There is a traffic-free walking and cycling route from Stuppington Lane to Langton Lane which provides access to Simon Langton Grammar School for Boys. This has a good surface and would be an attractive quiet route away from Old Dover Road, although conversely it is isolated from surveillance and sometimes overgrown in summer.

**Figure 3.13: Langton Lane**



- 3.2.25 There are high levels of motor traffic around Old Dover Road at school times and this could limit the uptake of cycling here without interventions.

### ***Countryside to South***

- 3.2.26 There is a large area of countryside around the southern boundary of the site and it is expected that this would attract Merton Park residents for recreational use, using the network of unsurfaced footpaths or quiet rural lanes such as Stuppington Lane. At this stage these routes have not been formally assessed using the WRAT tool, which relates more to urban connectivity.

## **3.3 Public Transport Services**

- 3.3.1 Public transport allows people to travel further afield than active modes, in a way that makes efficient use of energy and network capacity.
- 3.3.2 Canterbury already has high quality bus and/or rail connections to all of its 'nearest neighbour' towns including Faversham, Whitstable, Herne Bay, Sandwich, Dover, Folkestone and Ashford. It has two separate rail routes to Central London which also serve other towns in Mid and West Kent.

- 3.3.3 The draft Local Plan recognises the importance of good quality bus services in the city, as well as the role of rail for travel further afield.

### **Bus Services**

- 3.3.4 There are many bus routes available within walking distance of the site that can be used to access all of the neighbouring towns. The majority of these are run by Stagecoach, a leading bus operator in the UK. As well as providing comprehensive and regular services, Stagecoach also has a high-quality website and app to access timetable and route information, purchase tickets, track live buses, and route plan. Stagecoach is currently opted in to the nationwide £3 bus fare cap, which is due to operate until December 2025 and may be extended further.
- 3.3.5 The 'Old Waterworks' bus stop is located on the A28 Wincheap, approximately 550m (7-minute walk) from the western extent of the site. It is a 'Flag-Pole' stop with timetable lighting and timetable information. The timetable information for this stop, and which can be applied more generally to the A28 corridor, is provided below.

**Table 3.1: A28 Corridor – Old Waterworks Bus Stop**

Bus No.	Service Provider	Routes	Weekdays			Weekends	
			Frequency	First Bus	Last Bus	Sat	Sun
653	Stagecoach	Canterbury - Chartham	Twice per day	08:24	15:11	-	-
649	Stagecoach	Brymore Road – Hollowmede	Once per day	-	15:25	-	-
667	Regent Coaches	Challock – Canterbury	4 per day	07:57	16:15	-	-
1	Stagecoach	Ashford – Canterbury	1 per day	08:04	-	-	-
1A	Stagecoach	Chartham – Canterbury	Hourly	07:51	17:03	Hourly	-
1X	Stagecoach	Ashford - Canterbury	Hourly	07:04	18:19	Hourly	-

- 3.3.6 Oxford Road intersects Lime Kiln Road approximately 800m northwest of the site (10-minute walk). The 'Oxford Road' bus stops are serviced by one bus, which is a school service. It is a flagpole type stop with streetlighting and timetable information.

**Table 3.2: Lime Kiln Road – Oxford Road Bus Stop**

Bus No.	Service Provider	Routes	Weekdays			Weekends	
			Frequency	First Bus	Last Bus	Sat	Sun
649	Stagecoach	Brymore Road – Hollowmede	Four per day	11:18	15:18	-	-

3.3.7 There are several bus stops within and around the hospital site, including the 'Emergency Care' stop. These are all served by Service 25, as summarised below. The Emergency Care bus stop is located within the carpark of the hospital, 450m from the eastern extent of the site (6-minute walk) and is sheltered with benches, lighting, and timetable information.

**Table 3.3: The Hospital – Emergency Care Centre Bus Stop**

Bus No.	Service Provider	Routes	Weekdays			Weekends	
			Frequency	First Bus	Last Bus	Sat	Sun
25	Stagecoach	City Centre – Kent & Canterbury Hospital	Every 10 minutes	06:37	22:50	Every 20 minutes	Every hour

3.3.8 The 'Ethelbert Road' bus stop is located on Old Dover Road, approximately 900m (11-minute walk) from the site. This stop is serviced by a large range of public and school services, as well as the P3 Park and Ride service. The stop consists of a flag-pole type stop and streetlighting.

**Table 3.4: Old Dover Road – Ethelbert Road Bus Stop**

Bus No.	Service Provider	Routes	Weekdays			Weekends	
			Frequency	First Bus	Last Bus	Sat	Sun
5	Stagecoach	Seasalter & Yorklets – Canterbury	Hourly	08:55	19:15	Hourly	Every 2 hours
17	Stagecoach	Folkestone – Canterbury Bus Station	Hourly	08:15	19:36	Hourly	Every 3 hours
18	Stagecoach	Canterbury – Hythe	Every 2 hours	08:58	18:18	Every 2.5 hours	-
18A	Stagecoach	Canterbury – Ashford	Once per day	08:19	16:18	-	-

Bus No.	Service Provider	Routes	Weekdays			Weekends	
			Frequency	First Bus	Last Bus	Sat	Sun
620	Regent Coaches	Canterbury - Bodsham	4 per day	08:26	17:48	3 per day	-
667	Regent Coaches	Challock – Canterbury	4 per day	07:57	16:15	-	-
903	Stagecoach	Herne Bay – St Anselm’s School	Once per day	-	15:48	-	-
904	Stagecoach	Herne Bay – Simon Langton Boys’ School	Once per day	08:12	16:06	-	-
906	Stagecoach	Herne Bay – Simon Langton Girls’ School	Once per day	-	15:38	-	-
951	Stagecoach	Canterbury – Simon Langton Boys’ School	Twice per day	8:33	8:39	-	-
955	Stagecoach	Canterbury – St Anselms & Simon Langton Boys’ School	Once per day	-	15:45	-	-
P3	Stagecoach	New Dover Road Park & Ride – Canterbury Whitefriars	Every 10 minutes	07:05	19:25		

3.3.9 Overall, there are a significant range of regular and low-cost bus services operating within 800m of the site from which residents can access services across much of east Kent. The Stagecoach bus map for Canterbury is included in **Appendix B**.

### ***Rail Services***

3.3.10 There are two train stations within Canterbury that provide access to an array of different services to locations across Kent and London. This includes High Speed services to London St. Pancras, Stratford International, Ebbsfleet International, and Ashford International, as the only High-Speed service in the country. From St. Pancras International, passengers can then access the Euro Star to a number of iconic cities in Europe. A map of the Southeastern railway routes is included in **Appendix B**.

3.3.11 Canterbury West Station is located north of the town centre region, approximately 1.7km from the northern boundary of the site, equating to around a 25-minute walk.

3.3.12 There are 134 cycle stands provided and step-free access to all platforms with lifts available, as well as a taxi rank at the front of the station. The services available from the station are provided in the table below.

**Table 3.5: Canterbury West Train Services**

Services	Frequency	Journey Time
Ramsgate	Hourly	24 minutes
Margate	Hourly	35 minutes
London St Pancras	Hourly	56 minutes
London Charing Cross	30 – 60 minutes	1 hour 30 minutes

3.3.13 Canterbury East is 1km north of the site with a main access on Station Road East, approximately a 14-minute walk. However, access can also be taken from Gordon Road opposite Martyrs' Field Road for step-free access to Platform 1.

3.3.14 A taxi rank is provided at the front of the station, and 46 bicycle stands are provided at Platform 2. The services available are shown in the table below.

**Table 3.6: Canterbury East Train Services**

Services	Frequency	Journey Time
London Victoria	Hourly	1 hour 34 minutes
Chatham	Hourly	47 minutes
Dover Priory	Hourly	27 minutes

### 3.4 Summary

3.4.1 As recognised in the draft Local Plan and shown in this chapter, Canterbury already benefits from a range of active travel and public transport connections.

## 4 Mobility Demand Context

### 4.1 Overview

4.1.1 With reference to the previously discussed 'Triple Access System' we can see that measures to increase sustainable accessibility that substantially eliminate the need for travel (mobility) are to be encouraged. However, it remains clear that there will be a substantial residual need for mobility. As reflected in both national and local policies, the context for new developments has changed in recent years. Instead of facilitating this residual mobility demand by providing first and foremost for the motorised road users, the focus should be on improving quality for pedestrians and cyclists and enhancing sustainable travel between new developments and key destinations.

4.1.2 This section of the report presents a means of forecasting that residual mobility demand in a manner which allows a detailed understanding of the likely pattern of the mobility and thus the opportunities for a shift to more sustainable modes. This evidence base both allows effective and efficient targeting of interventions to the routes most people travel and it also allows the identification of a maximum potential for non-motorised movements.

4.1.3 The exercise presented below is distinct from a conventional forecast of person trip generation by mode, insofar as it focuses on the plausible 'potential' for travel by sustainable means. However, it lays the foundations for a series of forecasts of likely trip generation outcome that can inform assessment of residual traffic impact, as part of a wider scenario testing.

#### ***Summary Methodology***

4.1.4 While more detail is provided below, the methodology adopted for this exercise can be summarised as follows. Firstly, traditionally derived forecast traffic generation has been extracted from the current KCC Strategic Transport Model for Canterbury, looking specifically at the demand associated with the proposed allocation of Merton Park on an 'origin-destination' (OD) basis. Secondly, this data is correlated to the current sustainable travel context discussed above to determine the potential for this demand to utilise alternative modes. Finally, by applying appropriate and reasonable constraint to the potential for people to use alternative modes, such as not assuming that journeys on foot will take place beyond 1 mile, the maximum potential for mode shift can be derived. Again, this should not be confused with a forecast of what would happen, rather it provides a context of what could occur.

## 4.2 Source Demand Data

- 4.2.1 As is often the case; CCC in coordination with KCC have developed a strategic level transport model to allow forecasting of the implications and impacts of Local Plan and Transport Strategy on the transport network. The current model is a cordon of the Kent Strategic Transport Model, for the Canterbury area. Initially runs of this model have been undertaken that include the proposed development at Merton Park and its forecast travel demand. These were the principally the scenario modelling discussed in the *Initial Traffic Impact Assessment* document submitted alongside this sustainable transport strategy.
- 4.2.2 It is beyond the scope of this report to discuss the full detail of that model. However, in summary the model is fundamentally a highway assignment model that uses a prior demand modelling exercise to determine where and by what means travel is forecast to take place. This demand is then applied to the highway network by means of a series of 'origin-destination' (OD) matrices of the residual traffic demand.
- 4.2.3 The distribution of demand across the network is based on conventional principles, using relevant data including from the national census and other sources. It represents a sound basis for understanding the anticipated movement of people across the transport network.
- 4.2.4 The forecasting of mode of travel is similarly based on empirical data but at a relatively aggregated level with net vehicle trip rates broadly consistent across the existing and proposed development areas, albeit with some generalised assumption of mode shift potential. The resultant vehicle trips applied to the highway assignment model therefore already assume an element of non-car travel, but not one derived entirely site specifically. They are also largely constrained to the empirical data and are unlikely to be aspirational.
- 4.2.5 With the above in mind, C&A have engaged with KCC's term strategic modelling consultant to extract this forecast traffic demand, in the form of the OD matrices, specific to Merton Park.
- 4.2.6 The strategic model differentiates vehicle trips in user classes based on trip purpose. The user classes for cars, when excluding HGVs and LGVs are:
1. User Class 1 (UC1) – car commute,
  2. User Class 2 (UC2) – car employer's business,
  3. User Class 3 (UC3) – car other.
- 4.2.7 It was considered that the trips that could be made by sustainable mode instead of car involved only User Classes 1 and 3, while trips under User Class 2 were more difficult to influence.

- 4.2.8 As would be anticipated, the strategic model demand data forecasts vehicle trips taking place between a wide range of OD pairs associated with Merton Park, including for instance car-based trips for journeys between the development and the City Centre.

### 4.3 Criteria for Assumed Potential Sustainable Travel

- 4.3.1 As should be apparent, for a development in such a highly sustainable location relative to the major trip attractor of the City Centre; significant car-based trips on this route would be considered undesirable and, in the majority of cases, unnecessary. It is of course accepted that some residual car-based travel on even the shortest and most well served routes is inevitably required, such as for those who are car dependant due to for instance, mobility impairment. Such aspects are appropriate to be accounted for in any actual forecast of likely residual traffic demand which is not a part of this current exercise.

- 4.3.2 However, for current purposes the objective is to derive the maximum potential for sustainable and in particular non-car travel. Accordingly, the OD data extracted from the strategic model was analysed by means of cross-reference to the development locational context discussed above. In summary, each OD pair was evaluated on the basis of its potential to be served by a non-car mode route, applying reasonable constraints applicable to the modes. For example, while theoretically it would be possible to travel anywhere without use of the car, in some cases doing so would incur significant journey penalties, including cost, time and inconvenience, so as to be highly unrealistic. Therefore, while the objective here is to derive the 'maximum' potential use of sustainable travel for the forecast travel demand, it is appropriate that this remains grounded in reasonable assumptions of what is plausible. As will be clear from the following paragraphs, it is important to again draw a clear distinction between the plausible potential for mode use and likely propensity for this to take place. This exercise considers 'potential' and is therefore not focused on the quality of a route, which would instead influence the 'propensity' for its use, an exercise to be conducted later when seeking to forecast likely travel patterns which will also take account of the interventions to improve factors such as quality, presented in this report.

#### ***Potential Walking Route***

- 4.3.3 When considering a route as being viably undertaken by walking; two main criteria were applied: 1) the availability of a route; and 2) the acceptability of a distance.

4.3.4 For this initial exercise of maximum potential, a route was considered to be available if it exists now or could be reasonably be assumed to be inherently established with the advent of development (for instance a basic pedestrian access to the development). Therefore, any practically and legally available route was included, disregarding at this stage any qualitative assessment of it. Information from the audit contained in Section 3 of this report was utilised for this purpose.

4.3.5 For the distance criterion, any route of total distance of 1 mile or less was considered to be viable as a walking route, based on the CIHT *Planning for Walking* guidance. This distance was measured along the practical walk route derived above, not simply 'as the crow flies' and broadly from the centroids of the zones within the OD pairs.


### ***Potential for Cycling***

4.3.6 A similar approach to that applied for walking was adopted for cycling. When considering the availability of routes for cycling, these again needed to be legal and practical now or that could be established as a basic component of development. Again, quality of the route was not a factor, such that cycling could be assumed to potentially take place on any street or on an appropriately designated PROW (bridleway, byway etc. but not a footpath – except where the access strategy to development can and would redesignate this).

4.3.7 The distance criterion for cycling has been based on based on the CIHT *Planning for Walking* to give a maximum potential route distance of 5km.

4.3.8 The map below shows that the walking potential catchment from Site N1 includes most of the defined town centre, East station and the bus station. The cycling potential catchment includes the remainder of the town centre, West station and the University of Kent campus.

Figure 4.1: Walking and cycling potential catchments



### ***Potential for Public Transport Use***

- 4.3.9 Determining whether public transport presents a realistic potential alternative to the car for any OD pair associated with the development requires a broader consideration of criteria. A public transport trip necessarily includes an additional first mode of travel to reach the PT access point - the obvious example being a walk to the bus stop. However, this could also include cycling to the station or potentially even a short car-based journey that might be considered as part of an otherwise overall sustainable journey. It is also quite common for a wider combination of modes to be reasonably employed, such as a short walk to the bus stop, followed by a bus ride to the railway station for onwards travel – or the use of two, connecting bus journeys.

- 4.3.10 It might generally be assumed that a bus stop would be easily accessible if within 400m of the individual dwellings. For a development of this scale, the centroid of the development is greater than 400m from the site boundary. It is therefore inevitable that some form of bus provision will therefore be delivered on site, through new and/or diverted services, bringing the proposed dwellings within 400m of a bus stop. This has been assumed to be case for this exercise. However, no assumptions have been made regarding new or improved services in a wider context - it has simply been assumed that access to existing services will be supported and the routes/destinations provided by these.
- 4.3.11 Similarly for rail, the current baseline service is assumed, accessed via the current stations. Conventionally it is assumed that 800m represents a reasonable assumption for walk access to a rail station, something achievable for much of the development to Canterbury East Station. However, this ignores the inherent potential referred to earlier of combined bus/rail and cycle/rail journeys. Accordingly, it has been assumed that by these means access could be achieved via Canterbury West station as well.
- 4.3.12 It would of course be unreasonable to assume that combined mode journeys can be anticipated to occur without constraint as an alternative to car journeys – particularly for regular trips such as commuting in the peak period. Combined mode journeys include increased potential for unreliability and overall travel time due to the delays incurred during mode transfer. To provide a reasonable constraint, the current method has capped the overall journey time by public transport primary trip to 1 hour for any OD pair. This includes the combination of travel by each component mode, including for instance the walk to/from the local access point. Clearly, travel by public transport for journeys over 1 hour are possible; but the current method is focused on the typical peak hour journeys that future occupiers would take regularly, such as the commute, where a 1 hour limit is reasonable.

## 4.4 Maximum Potential for Sustainable Travel

- 4.4.1 The aforementioned traffic demand data provides insight into the anticipated origins and destinations of car trips associated with the proposed development, when forecast using conventional methods. For each of those OD pairs, it has been possible to examine the reasonable potential alternatives that could be adopted for those journeys. In some cases, journeys are predicted to take place to/from locations for which there are currently no reasonable alternatives to the car. However, in a significant number of cases, entirely practical and reasonable sustainable alternatives were identified to exist, yet the forecasting assumes that they would take place by car. In a local and national policy context that seeks to maximise sustainable travel, these journeys represent potentially unnecessary car-based trips that should be discouraged and arguably not facilitated. Understanding the extent of this provides invaluable insight into the inherent potential within the proposed allocation.
- 4.4.2 As shown in **Appendix D**, when applying the analysis discussed above, it has been determined that 78% of the forecast residual car trips within the strategic highway assignment model are anticipated to take place between OD pairs for which there are reasonably practical, sustainable alternatives. This is hugely significant and highlights the inherent latent potential for sustainable travel in a site such as Merton Park. Setting aside for a moment that some residual car use would be required by those dependant on it for all journeys, such as those with mobility impairment, it can be seen that **only 22% of conventionally forecast vehicle trips need to take place by car.**
- 4.4.3 As an example, the data indicates that nearly 15% of the forecast residual car-based trips in the strategic highway assignment model take place between the site and locations which are served by existing walk routes and have an overall distance of less than 1 mile. This is unsurprising given the proposed development allocation's proximity to the city centre.
- 4.4.4 To provide some context to the implications; reference can be made to the resultant car trips in the peak hour. The underlying model forecasts some 700 to 800 vehicle trips being generated by the development in the peak hours and then assigned to the local network, including some 15% which would be assigned to very local routes including towards and into the City Centre. Were it possible to encourage all of those who could, to use alternative non-car modes readily available, this additional traffic demand could be reduced to some 150 to 175 vehicle trips in the peak hours.

## 4.5 Implications for Infrastructure Planning

- 4.5.1 Understanding the demand for mobility arising from the development is critical in shaping the vision for the development. As the NPPF makes clear (ref. para. 115a), the opportunities to promote sustainable transport should take into consideration both the type and location of the development. A vision for development must be aspirational and therefore it is critically important to understand the inherent potential of the site and its location.
- 4.5.2 Furthermore, knowledge of how the mobility demand manifests itself across the geography of the study area and allows the interventions to be more effectively and efficiently targeted to maximise returns on investment.
- 4.5.3 By extension to the above, such information on inherent potential within the forecast demand can inform decisions that avoid misguided or counterproductive infrastructure investment. Taking the example cited before – some 15% of conventionally forecast traffic demand would take place to/from locations within 1 mile of the site, largely locations within the city. Conventional ‘predict and provide’ assessment techniques would generally carry forward such forecasting to a highway network infrastructure delivery exercise aiming to ‘mitigate’ the impact of the development. The information set out in this report reinforces how this is now considered misguided.
- 4.5.4 As the data in this chapter shows, 78% of development generated trips would conventionally be forecast to take place to/from destinations which are already well provided for by other means. As is the case for much of the network, these trips are not forecast to take place by car because of a lack of alternative options, it is the relative attractiveness of the alternative that influences the travel decision. This ‘attractiveness’ is a summation of a wide range of factors, including actual/perceived cost; awareness; perceived reliability etc. In all cases however, the evaluation is relative between the alternative mode/s and the car. Conventionally travel plan measures focus on improving the non-car modes – yet often such plans have failed to achieve the objectives. It is now clear that this is, in part, a result of the counterproductive exercise of mitigating and thus improving the traffic/highway network through development delivery alongside aspirations to discourage use of that mode.
- 4.5.5 Taking the City Centre example again – this would mean seeking to provide significant investment in sustainable travel modes to/from the City Centre whilst simultaneously improving the operation of the highway/traffic network to accommodate robust forecasts of traffic demand – and thereafter being surprised/disappointed that future residents choose to use their cars unnecessarily in the manner predicted.

- 4.5.6 It is useful to make reference to the initial traffic assessment accompanying this report, as submitted in response to the Regulation 18 consultation. That initial traffic assessment was based on robust trip rates thus assuming that all of the trip aforementioned 78% vehicle demand does not shift to other modes and simply continues to use the car. Despite this, the initial assessment indicated net overall improvements in the operation of the network to the extent that it was suggested the highway interventions were likely to be disproportionate to the scale of impact from the allocations – particularly given the potential for such excess performance to be counterproductive to the objectives of sustainable travel. It is likely that the objectives of the wider sustainable development policy are therefore more effectively achieved by placing focus, certainly in the earlier period of development, on sustainable travel interventions that maximise the positive outcomes.
- 4.5.7 This report focuses on those sustainable travel interventions and therefore embraces the fundamental principles of vision-led planning. In the following section, that vision is presented in the context the inherent potential of the site, followed in subsequent sections by the measures proposed to realise the vision.

## 5 Transport Vision

### 5.1 The Vision

5.1.1 As discussed previously, NPPF paragraph 115a makes clear that opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes should be relevant and proportionate to the type and location of development. It is considered that the overarching transport vision should be defined in the opportunity context outlined above.

5.1.2 From the assessment of location and demand context discussed above, it is apparent that development of Merton Park has the potential to be exceptionally sustainable. It presents an opportunity to be an exemplar of aspirational sustainable living. Even looking nationally, such opportunities are rare and it is important that the vision seeks to make best use of this potential.

5.1.3 The proposed development would embrace the following core principles.

#### Dive into digital

- Link up with public services – education, healthcare, local businesses to make these available to residents by digital means, so that residents do not need to make short, single purpose trips (by any mode).

#### Make the most of the walkable neighbourhood

- Develop high quality pedestrian and cycle links between the site and Canterbury city centre and elsewhere such that they become the simple, obvious, and therefore default choice for majority of short to medium distance trips.

#### Public Transport first medium to long distance travel.

- Maximise access to public transport, linking to and enhancing existing bus provision and connections to the already high-quality rail services such that public transport becomes the first preference for medium to long distance travel.

#### Embrace the constraints

- Use the context of the constrained vehicle network in Canterbury to encourage residents towards sustainable modes – saving them time and money on short trips.

#### Relegate motor vehicles

- Recognise that in this location and market residents will likely retain a car, but they will not be the mode of choice for the majority of trips.

## 5.2 Precedents for Aspirational Sustainable Living

5.2.1 Development at Merton Park presents a rare opportunity in the region to bring forward development that genuinely offers a high quality; spacious; desirable and thus aspirational place to live, but in which residents will be both able and willing choose to access services in the most sustainable manner.

5.2.2 This approach to bringing forward development which balances desirable location without inherent car dependence is not unique – but Merton Park proposes to build on the best examples and go further. Below are some of those examples.

### *Oxford*

5.2.3 As in Canterbury, Oxford has a strong bus network, rail services to London and other major cities and a network of Park & Ride sites to intercept vehicle trips before they reach the historic city centre.


5.2.4 The 2020 Oxford Local Plan has identified similar characteristics and constraints as in Canterbury and proposes similar solutions:

*Oxford is a sub-regional hub and a focus for employment, retail, leisure, culture and tourism. The city centre has a medieval road system, with narrow streets, and areas of great heritage value. It has the ambition to become a world class cycling city with improved air quality, reduced congestion and enhanced public realm. Road space within the city is limited, so to achieve this ambition there is a need to re-prioritise road space in order to promote sustainable modes of movement, walking, cycling and public transport.*

### *Accordia, Cambridge*

- 5.2.6 Accordia is a large residential development which came forward on a brownfield site in Cambridge in the early 2000s.<sup>9</sup> Accordia has a similar location to the Merton Park site, within walking distance of the historic city centre of Cambridge and railway station to allow travel further afield.

**Figure 5.1: Accordia site location**



<sup>9</sup> Twentieth Century Society <https://c20society.org.uk/100-buildings/2008-accordia-housing-cambridge>

5.2.7 The Accordia layout prioritises permeability for pedestrians and cyclists with several mews-type streets and numerous parks where residents can meet and play. Walking and cycling routes follow key north-west and west-east desire lines across the site. Notably, the development has only one all-modes access from the wider highway network. It did not provide significant highway capacity improvements as this would have undermined the sustainable transport connections available at the site.

5.2.8 The development was intended to provide aspirational and desirable housing, using high-quality materials and extensive landscaping as shown below.

**Figure 5.2: Accordia housing in Cambridge<sup>10</sup>**



5.2.9 Most of the development is family housing, adopting generous space standards but still achieving a relatively high development density. The design quality of Accordia has been recognised through its multiple awards for design and planning.

<sup>10</sup> Photo © Fielden Clegg Bradley Studios

## 6 Interventions for Promoting Active Travel

### 6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 Active travel interventions focus on facilitating and encouraging walking, cycling and wheeling as primarily modes of transport or as part of combined mode journeys (such as alongside rail).
- 6.1.2 As has been extensively discussed, the proposed site allocation presents an ideal opportunity to maximise the use of active travel, leveraging the existing network of routes and importantly the proximity to the city centre.
- 6.1.3 The audit of existing routes provided in section 3 of this report sets the baseline against which to prioritise interventions. This has been cross-referenced with the review of mobility demand to ascertain the appropriate locations for interventions that maximise the potential for support for active travel of routes that residents will want to travel.

### 6.2 Draft Policy

- 6.2.1 The latest draft Policy N1 includes a series of measures to promote active travel between the site and surrounding areas, reflecting engagement to date between the site promoter, CCC and KCC.

#### *4 - Access and transportation*

*The access and transport strategy for the site should:*

- a) Provide safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle connectivity through the creation of new and improved routes including:*
- i) Connections to Wincheap and the Great Stour Way via Hollow Lane, and Victoria Road;*
  - ii) Connections to Thanington via Birch Road;*
  - iii) Connections to Canterbury East station including upgrades to Lime Kiln Road;*
  - iv) Connections to the city centre, including upgrades to Stuppington Lane, South Canterbury Road and Nunnery Fields;*
  - v) Improvements at Wincheap Roundabout and Riding Gate Roundabout to facilitate safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle access to the city centre;*
  - vi) A direct active travel corridor through the site between Site 10 (Policy CF1) and Hollow Lane;*
  - vii) Connections to school locations, both within the site and surrounding communities;*
  - viii) Connections to the wider countryside to the south and southeast;*
- and*
- ix) Improvements to the PRow network crossing and around the site as required.*

...

*f) Investigate the severing of Stuppington Lane to vehicular traffic, and repurposing for non-motorised vehicles and access;*

## 6.3 On-Site Connections

6.3.1 The latest draft Policy N1 states in relation to site design and layout:

### *1 – Development mix*

*Across the site the development mix will include (...)*

*Provision of a community hub as focal area for the community containing a mix of uses including*

*(1) Local centre including commercial (minimum 1,200sqm) and local shopping and community uses (minimum 480sqm));*

*(2) Business space (minimum 4,000sqm) including flexible working space; and*

*(3) A mobility hub to serve residents and businesses.*

### *2 – Design and layout*


*The design and layout of the site should: (...)*

*(b) Create a new mixed use community hub as an easily accessible focal point of the development in the format of a high street or village/ town square containing flexible outdoor space to use for community events, with pedestrians and cycles prioritised;*

6.3.2 Some everyday needs will be internalised by the above facilities, while others such as secondary education will be met in nearby existing areas of Canterbury. To reach these off-site areas, the layout includes several access 'gateways' of which some would serve all modes but many would be dedicated to pedestrian, cyclist and/or bus connections – particularly those orientated towards the city centre. The *Multimodal Access Principles* document covers these gateway points in detail and the key diagram is reproduced in **Appendix E** for ease.


6.3.3 In order for active travel routes to be the natural choice for residents, the layout will include direct and attractive walking, wheeling and cycling routes criss-crossing the site on the desire lines from all development plots to the access gateways, as in the example below.

**Figure 6.1: Active travel provision on key desire line (Rochester Riverside)**



6.3.4 In addition to direct active travel routes, the local distributor routes within the site would incorporate separate footways, cycleways and carriageways (to allow bus penetration) as shown below. For roads which serve more of a place than a movement function, a shared-space environment would be more appropriate.

**Figure 6.2: Example local distributor road**



6.3.5 At ‘side road’ junctions the active travel connections would be prioritised over motor vehicles using ‘Copenhagen crossings’ as illustrated below.

**Figure 6.3: Example treatment of side road junctions**




6.3.6 The objective of the masterplan and connectivity infrastructure will be to ensure that active travel routes to the gateways will be as direct and as short as possible, where necessary at the expense of vehicular modes.

6.3.7 From these gateway points the onward routes to key destinations have been considered in the following section.

#### 6.4 Off-Site Connections

6.4.1 The active travel audit, draft policy requirements and the levels of potential demand have informed the likely routes for active travel between Merton Park and the surrounding areas, as well as the most effective improvements which the site could support. The key routes are shown below with more detailed drawings in **Appendix F**.

Figure 6.4: Key off-site active travel connections



#### ***Hollow Lane / Homersham corridor to Wincheap***


- 6.4.2 As suggested in the draft policy, the development would provide improvements to active travel links towards the range of attractors in Wincheap. The demand analysis set out in Chapter 4 shows that around one-fifth of the potential walking demand and one-third of potential cycling demand would be from the site towards this area.
- 6.4.3 From the site residents are most likely to use the all-modes gateway onto Hollow Lane, which then forms a junction with Homersham slightly further north. The walking route via Homersham to the Wincheap retail area is generally good, with footways and street lighting. The A28 / Homersham and A28 / Ten Perch Road junctions incorporate pedestrian crossings in all directions and it is noted that the latter junction is proposed for reconfiguration to include the A2 off-slip, with crossings retained in the final design.

**Figure 6.5: Existing pedestrian provision on Homersham**



- 6.4.4 There are also some designated facilities for cycling, although the current A28 / Homersham junction does not incorporate crossings which cyclists can use so this could be improved. The section of Hollow Lane north of Hollowmede is proposed to be converted to one-way operation to reduce vehicle flows, but this could include provision for contra-flow cycling.
- 6.4.5 The staggered junction of the A28, Hollow Lane and Cow Lane would benefit from a comprehensive redesign including a controlled crossing for active travel modes supporting the north-south desire line across the A28.

**Figure 6.6: Example controlled pedestrian and cycling crossing – Vauxhall, London**



- 6.4.6 With reference to the ATE Crossing Selector Tool and existing traffic flows on Wincheap<sup>11</sup>, the tool suggests that a signalised crossing type would be required for the crossing geometry type and traffic flow volumes present at the junction, which could include some level of filtering for cyclists. The tool recommends either a filtered junction, a dedicated signalised cycle track, or potential banned left turn movements out of the minor roads.

#### ***Victoria Road corridor to Wincheap***

- 6.4.7 There is also a well-established and direct route towards the east part of Wincheap along the footpaths which run past Wincheap Allotments and then Victoria Road. This route currently runs into open countryside and so has limited use, but the completion of the Merton Park development would create a critical mass of demand on the route as well as providing more natural surveillance.
- 6.4.8 The footpath sections would be upgraded with suitable surfacing and lighting to enable year-round use as shown indicatively in **Drawing 22-022-046**. Signage would be provided on the overall route between the site and Wincheap.
- 6.4.9 The above measures would align with the draft site policy.

**Figure 6.7: Example of lit and surfaced footpath at night<sup>12</sup>**




<sup>11</sup> DfT <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/manualcountpoints/56170>

<sup>12</sup> Wikimedia Commons <File:Street lights illuminating a footpath in Tuntorp.jpg> - Wikimedia Commons

### *Lime Kiln Road corridor to Canterbury East station and City Centre*

- 6.4.10 Canterbury East will be a key destination for residents of the site, providing an alternative for car-based travel on the A2 corridor northwest and southeast of Canterbury. While the demand analysis superficially shows a low level of walking trips to this area as a destination in its own right, it will be a key route to access onward rail journeys from East station as well as parts of the City Centre.
- 6.4.11 To access East station residents would use the route via Lime Kiln Road and this would be improved as shown below. This would integrate with the draft site policy requirements to include cycle parking and passenger environment upgrades at East station.
- 6.4.12 The proposed improvements on this route are shown in **Drawings 22-022-043, 044 and 045** and explained below. Suitable signage would be provided along this corridor to direct users to East station and the west part of the city centre.
- 6.4.13 There is already a public footpath running north from the Merton Park site between Heaton Road and Chineham Way, which benefits from surfacing and street lighting. As above, this route currently sees limited use but the development would create a critical mass of use.
- 6.4.14 KCC could upgrade this section under the Cycle Tracks Act 1984 so that cycling is also permitted; this would transition into a shared space arrangement on the adopted highway at 1-7 Lime Kiln Road, which has minimal vehicle use.
- 6.4.15 The junction of Lime Kiln Road / Zealand Road is a focal point with local shops. This would benefit from placemaking improvements including a raised table arrangement.

Figure 6.8: Improvements at Zealand Road



- 6.4.16 To the north the Lime Kiln Road continues as a 'back of house' route between Lancaster Road and Cambridge Road. This section needs to retain vehicle access to garages and CCC have confirmed that it is used by their refuse collection vehicles, so it cannot be converted to a completely traffic-free route. It would be possible to improve the surface and install Class P5 lighting<sup>13</sup>, and potentially fund bin stores for residents to improve the general ambience.
- 6.4.17 However users could also make a minimal diversion of circa 25 metres onto the parallel Lancaster Road. This route already has street lighting and better natural surveillance from dwellings so this would probably be more popular than the 'back of house' route in any event.
- 6.4.18 Continuing north across Oxford Road, a further raised table improvement would guide pedestrians to the existing route along Martyr's Field Road and cyclists to the final section of Lime Kiln Road, both of which already benefit from street lighting.
- 6.4.19 Finally a similar improvement around Gordon Road would create a strong destination around Canterbury East station for onward travel. The above measures would align with the draft site policy.

**Figure 6.9: Example of quality public realm at Greenwich station, London**




<sup>13</sup> British Standards BS 5489 - Road lighting

### Stuppington Lane corridor to City Centre


- 6.4.20 The demand analysis shows that around one-quarter of potential walking demand from the site would head north towards the City Centre, where there is a significant cluster of employment, retail and leisure facilities including Whitefriars shopping centre. In addition, some residents would walk to Canterbury Bus Station for onward bus journeys.
- 6.4.21 Stuppington Lane will be the key gateway for most residents wishing to reach the city centre although given the range of origins within Site N1 and destinations within the city centre, for some residents the other routes considered in this chapter will be more direct.
- 6.4.22 While Stuppington Lane is currently a through all-purpose road, the proposed changes would remove nearly all motor traffic to facilitate active travel as shown in **Drawing 22-022-042** and explained below.
- 6.4.23 Stuppington Lane would become a 'dead end' for motor vehicles with a Traffic Regulation Order allowing access only to circa 15 dwellings on Stuppington Lane and Juniper Close. This would facilitate a modal filter at the site boundary to allow pedestrians and cyclists to and from Merton Park. Access to all existing dwellings would be maintained and one or two dwellings could be provided inside the boundary, providing natural surveillance and allowing vehicles to turn.

**Figure 6.10: Modal filter into Merton Park**




- 6.4.24 The remainder of Stuppington Lane would be converted to a shared space arrangement as shown below. Pedestrians and cyclists would be the dominant users in this environment and the allocation of street space reflects this, with separate pedestrian and cycle facilities separated by a 6mm upstand to assist visually impaired users.

**Figure 6.11: Reconfiguration of Stuppington Lane as active travel route**



- 6.4.25 In the occasional event of a motor vehicle using Stuppington Lane there would be space for them to safely pass active travel users, or another motor vehicle, by using the full width of the corridor. However these movements would be very much secondary to active travel.

Figure 6.12: Shared use of Stuppington Lane




6.4.26 Pedestrians and cyclists would then use South Canterbury Road and Nunnery Road or Nunnery Fields to continue north to the city centre. Here there are further opportunities to reconfigure existing street space away from motor vehicles to provide a high quality active travel corridor. Two-way streets can be converted to localised one-way systems as this releases space for contra-flow cycle lanes to allow cycling in both directions. Below shows an example and indicative reconfiguration of South Canterbury Road.

Figure 6.13: Example of one-way street with two-way cycling, Southwark



Figure 6.14: Example treatment of South Canterbury Road



6.4.27 The above measures would align with the draft site policy.

***Crossing the Ring Road***

6.4.28 Continuing north, the draft site policy and the draft CDTS both identify the Ring Road as a significant barrier to active travel into the city centre so key junctions would need to be reconfigured to overcome this. This is an issue that affects a number of proposed allocations and so the development would contribute to relevant works once identified through the wider Local Plan.

6.4.29 As suggested in the draft site policy and the draft CDTs, signalised junctions with formalised at-grade facilities for pedestrians and cyclists would be more attractive and are supported by modern design practice. The examples below show urban settings where active travel users are given safe and direct routes rather than being 'subservient' to motor traffic.

**Figure 6.15: High levels of active travel at Oxford Circus, London**



**Figure 6.16: Clear and direct active travel route at Dampoort Junction, Ghent**



6.4.30 The City Centre is also part of the onward route to the University of Kent, which represents around one-fifth of potential cycling demand from the above analysis. Improvements to the Ring Road would go a significant way to improving the attractiveness of cycling to the University area, despite the topographical challenges to the north of the city centre.

6.4.31 The above measures would align with the draft site policy.

#### ***Oaten Hill corridor to Abbey Area***

6.4.32 This area east of the city centre represents around one-fifth of potential walking demand from the above analysis and an even higher one-third of potential cycling demand, so the measures below are focused particularly on strengthening cycling. To reach this area residents would again use the Stuppington Lane gateway as described above.

6.4.33 The Mountfield Park committed development will provide an improvement scheme for Nunnery Fields, Oaten Hill, Upper Chantry Lane and their junctions with Old Dover Road and New Dover Road as shown below.

**Figure 6.17: Mountfield Park scheme around Oaten Hill**



- 6.4.34 The Merton Park development would take these improvements further to complete an orbital active travel corridor between Merton Park and the Abbey area. This could include wider footways and a give-way system on the carriageway through the Nunnery Fields bridge pinch point as shown in the example below, and upgrades to the Nunnery Fields / Old Dover Road junction consistent with the above drawing.

**Figure 6.18: Example treatment for bridge constraint**



***Langton Lane corridor to south east***

- 6.4.35 The secondary schools in this area would generate pupil demand from the site, and secondary age pupils typically can and want to travel to school independently; furthermore the Hospital would be a significant employer and a general a healthcare destination for residents. Demand analysis shows that this area represents around one-third of potential walking demand and a similar level of potential cycling demand.
- 6.4.36 The South Canterbury Road gateway will provide immediate access to the Hospital while the Langton Lane gateway is already a popular route to the schools and will remain so for the proposed development.
- 6.4.37 While there is a designated pedestrian and cycle connection from Stuppington Lane (north) to Langton Lane, this route is currently unlit, isolated and can be overgrown with vegetation. It should be noted that if the development goes ahead, there would be residential development closer to the link than now. This would create natural surveillance and it would become appropriate to introduce a lighting scheme as illustrated below, subject to ecological constraints.

Figure 6.19: Example of footway/cycleway lighting (Veelite)



### *Countryside to South*

6.4.38 As required by the draft policy, the development will provide improvements to the local PROW network in consultation with KCC. As shown above, Stuppington Lane will be filtered by the development and so the rural section to the south will become a more attractive route for recreational walking and cycling.

## **6.5 Other Measures**

6.5.1 The CDTS refers to the establishment of a cycle hire scheme in Canterbury during the first five years of the Local Plan period. Once this is operational, a hire station would be installed in Merton Park so that residents who do not own their own cycle can still benefit from cycling to the city centre or University of Kent.

## 7 Measures to Promote Public Transport

### 7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 As shown in Chapter 3, Canterbury has comprehensive bus and rail links to many of the surrounding towns and to Greater London, and so it is clear that some residents already use non-car modes to travel beyond the city itself.

7.1.2 While active travel and the proximity to services will cater for much of the travel demand within Canterbury, each of the neighbouring towns has a distinct mix of employment, education, retail and leisure facilities and so it is recognised that residents will want to access these locations as well. The same applies to Greater London which again offers a broader range of opportunities than can be found in Kent. The longer distance and resulting journey times to these destinations do not favour active travel for most residents, but do present an opportunity for public transport use.

7.1.3 For this reason, the Merton Park development will take advantage of committed public transport improvements and provide further targeted improvements to maximise the uptake of public transport for appropriate journeys.

### 7.2 Draft Policy

7.2.1 The latest draft Policy N1 includes requirements for public transport as follows:

#### *4 - Access and transportation*

*The access and transport strategy for the site should:*

*(b) Provide improvements to Canterbury East Station to include facilities for cycle parking and passenger flows;*

*c) Provide good public transport facilities through the site, including a bus-only connection to the fast bus link located in Site 10 (Policy CF1), with a new bus route with bus priority measures, connecting residential areas and the community hub to adjacent local areas and the city centre;*

## 7.3 Initial Improvements

### *Fast Bus Route*

7.3.2 The Mountfield Park allocation in the 2017 Local Plan and the subsequently approved planning application include a “Fast Bus” which would run between Mountfield Park, the Kent and Canterbury Hospital and the city centre. This would avoid the generation of motor traffic from Mountfield Park Old Dover Road / New Dover Road; consequently it would reduce demand for car parking in the city centre; and it would improve access to the Hospital from a wider area. While Site N1 is closer to the city centre than Mountfield Park and so active travel might be more attractive for some residents to access the city centre, the site will still be able to take advantage of the Fast Bus service.

### *Canterbury – Ashford Bus Corridor*

7.3.3 Consideration has also been given to the diversion of the existing Canterbury – Ashford bus service as show below. This currently runs from Canterbury Bus Station onto the A28 Wincheap corridor, and then continues to Chilham and Ashford which is a significant attractor of trips.

7.3.4 With a relatively small diversion away from the A28 Wincheap corridor, the service could instead serve the Merton Park site, adding significant additional patronage and providing a useful connection from the site to Ashford. While there is a rail link from Canterbury West to Ashford International, this requires Merton Park residents to take an initial journey to West station and an on-site connection would be more attractive.

7.3.5 Drawing the above considerations together, **Appendix G** shows an overall bus route between Ashford and Canterbury which could serve Cockerling Farm, Saxon Fields, Site N1 and Land North of Hollow Lane. An indicative timetabling exercise shows that this diversion could be accommodated with relatively minor timing changes, using four vehicles to provide a 30 minutes frequency.

### *Rail Improvements*

7.3.6 Due to its proximity to Canterbury East railway station, the development would generate additional passenger demand via the station and so it would contribute towards improvements which would be agreed with CCC and Network Rail.

7.3.7 It is noted that other draft allocations in the Local Plan are expected to contribute towards platform extensions at Canterbury West station to accommodate 12-car trains.

7.3.8 Both of these proposed improvements will ensure that there is no suppression of demand for rail travel from Merton Park, which could limit the potential for modal shift.

## 7.4 Longer Term Transport Innovation

7.4.1 Any prediction of future transport trends, both patterns of movement and the technology and solutions that support it, is challenging. However, it remains the case that the Local Plan period will coincide with apparent evolution in transport technology and opportunities to maximise sustainable travel will be missed if this is not embraced.

7.4.2 To do this it is useful to set a hypothesis of how public transport may change, which is broadly considered to follow the following trends:

- **Digital services** – Contemporary buses benefit from real-time information, contactless payment and mobile ticketing which did not exist at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century - it is likely that further digital shifts will take place;
- Sustainable **propulsion** – There will be an increasing shift away from internal combustion engine (ICE) propulsion towards alternative fuels, most likely Battery Electric Vehicles (BEV) for local routes;
- **Smaller vehicles, more frequent** – To respond to the more granular needs of users and to challenge the dominance of the private car, the physical size and passenger capacity of public transport vehicles will reduce, coupled with an increase in frequency and flexibility on routing. In part, this will be facilitated by fleet opportunities offered by the aforementioned switch to BEV, but the full potential will be released by:
- **Vehicle Automation** – Driver costs represent a notable part of any public transport service and a constraint to smaller more frequent and flexible services. Automation will release this constraint and the technology is rapidly evolving. Such technology will further extend beyond public transport to home delivery services.

7.4.3 In the Canterbury context, the CDTS anticipates in the short term (by 2030) the “establishment of a Mobility as a Service platform. This is a digital service that allows for a variety of sustainable transportation modes to be paid for in one transaction.” The strategy also acknowledges the recent e-scooter trial in Canterbury and allows for the possibility that similar small powered vehicles will be legalised in the future.

- 7.4.4 Looking to the long term (by 2040), the CDTs mentions “A modular electric connected autonomous vehicle to reach smaller villages and settlements that cannot sustain a commercial bus service”. While this does not reflect the location of Merton Park, it is likely that Merton Park residents will want to explore the attractive countryside which surrounds Canterbury and the proposal described here would easily facilitate this sort of journey.

## 8 Managing Residual Vehicle Trips

### 8.1 Overview

8.1.1 The measures in the preceding chapters aim to maximise the use of active travel and public transport modes in accordance with the NPPF and the draft Local Plan. However the promoter appreciates that these modes will not cover all possible trips to all possible destinations at all possible times, and so private vehicles will remain part of the Merton Park transport mix.

### 8.2 Parking and Electric Vehicles

8.2.1 The proposals will include EV charging points for all dwellings to support the continuing uptake of electric and hybrid vehicles, which now comprise 50% of new car registrations.<sup>14</sup> The provision will follow the KCC standards as shown below or the guidance in place at the time of application.


**Table 8.1: Kent Design Guide Electric Vehicle Standards**

Dwelling Parking Type	Charging Point Type
Dwelling with On-Plot Parking	1 Active Charging Point per dwelling minimum output rating 7kW
Dwellings with Unallocated Communal Parking	10% Active Charging Spaces and 100% Passive Charging Spaces
All Uses with Off-Street Parking	10% Active Charging Spaces and 100% Passive Charging Spaces

8.2.2 Rapid chargers have the ability to charge a vehicle in as little as 20 minutes. There is already an ultra-rapid charger at Morrisons Wincheap close to the site as shown below, and further similar chargers could be provided within the Policy N1 site.

<sup>14</sup> SMMT <https://www.smmt.co.uk/vehicle-data/car-registrations/>

Figure 8.1: Wincheap ultra-rapid charger




### 8.3 Off-Site Parking Matters

- 8.3.1 KCC raised concerns that the proposed mitigation scheme around Homersham and Hollow Lane could affect the on-street parking which currently occurs here. To investigate this C&A commissioned overnight parking beat surveys in April 2025 covering Homersham, Hollow Lane and the associated cul-de-sacs.
- 8.3.2 As shown in **Appendix H**, the parking stress did not exceed 50% for on-street parking bays or 67% for private parking courts. This suggests that car ownership in this area is significantly lower than anticipated by the local provision, suggesting that some residents do not own cars due to the sustainable highly sustainable location. It also suggests that some on-street parking bays could be removed without adverse effects on the local highway network.

## 8.4 Car Club

8.4.1 A car club is essentially a small group or organisation that agree to share one vehicle to reduce the individual and environmental costs of maintaining and running multiple personal cars. These can run on multiple scales, from a 'unofficial' neighbourhood agreement, to large scale, nationwide businesses that provide and maintain one or more vehicles in a particular area for rental on a one-time or regular basis.

8.4.2 Co-Wheels is one such car club that maintains multiple vehicles across the country, for a rental cost per hour + mileage and monthly membership fee. Co-Wheels currently have 4 hybrid vehicles in Canterbury, 3 of which are located within a 1.6km walking distance of the site. If residents wished to become a member of the car club, they would be issued with a smart card to access the car and book easily for whatever period is required using the app, returning the car to its allocated parking space.



## 8.5 Monitor and Manage

8.5.1 The scale of the site provides an opportunity to influence travel behaviour from the outset. The site will be covered by a comprehensive Framework Travel Plan (FTP) as is required by the NPPF paragraph 118 which aligns with the "Monitor and Manage" approach used for Mountfield Park.

- 8.5.2 In the first instance, as set out within the Mountfield Park S106 Agreement, a Travel Plan Coordinator must be appointed prior to occupation of the first unit, who is responsible for implementing and promoting the Travel Plan, commissioning annual surveys, and providing up-to-date travel information, as well as being the main point of contact for travel related queries.
- 8.5.3 Travel Plan targets would be reviewed within 3 months of occupation of the 100<sup>th</sup> dwelling and then annually based on the baseline data collected. Targets, if met, would then be modified to be further challenging, in consultation with KCC and CCC, to ensure they are 'realistic and achievable'.
- 8.5.4 Annual Travel Surveys should be obtained from residents to monitor travel patterns, as well as the collection of traffic data through annual ATC surveys to 'establish trends in the level of vehicular traffic associated with Mountfield Park'.
- 8.5.5 The Travel Plan should be updated annually with an Annual Monitoring Report produced and distributed KCC, and the results shared with residents through, for example, noticeboards, websites, and social media. An annual launch of the Travel Plan is also recommended for new residents and to provide updates and travel support.
- 8.5.6 A budget would be decided and reviewed annually to assess the level of investment required to meet targets. Any on-going measures and management would be the responsibility of the Travel Plan Coordinator and the developer.
- 8.5.7 Sanctions for unmet targets would need to be discussed with CCC and KCC. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that these would "need to be reasonable and proportionate", and that non-financial sanctions may be more appropriate in some instances, such as increased marketing of sustainable modes.
- 8.5.8 The lifetime of the Mountfield Park TP was over 15-years, and, reflected by the size of the development, it is likely that the Merton Park TP will cover a similar period. The TPC should consider revised travel plan initiatives if it is deemed at an early stage that targets will not be met, and these should be "guided by the outcomes of the annual monitoring of the Travel Plan" before financial sanctions are adopted.
- 8.5.9 The proposed primary school on the site would have a bespoke TP in line with the Jambusters management process promoted by KCC Transport Innovations.<sup>15</sup>
- 8.5.10 The Travel Plan would aim to:

---

<sup>15</sup> KCC Jambusters <https://jambusterstpms.co.uk/x.jsp?ano=86&category=school&topic=p2>

- Encourage all users (residents, employees, school pupils and visitors) to use active travel and public transport where possible;
- Make users of all the sustainable transport options available for their everyday journeys; and thereby
- Minimise single-occupancy private car trips associated with the site.

8.5.11 The developer or a management company would take on the role of Travel Plan Coordinator and this would include the following responsibilities:

- Promoting sustainable travel among residents and employees;
- Liaising with bus and rail operators;
- Acting as a contact point for travel queries from residents and employees;
- Monitoring travel patterns via surveys and reporting back to CCC and KCC;
- Agreeing modal share targets with CCC and KCC.

## 9 Summary

- 9.1.1 This report provides a site-specific Sustainable Transport Strategy in support of the proposed allocation for development of Site N1 in the emerging Canterbury City Council Local Plan (2040). This follows recent engagement between the site promoter, CCC and KCC.
- 9.1.2 Set out herein is a comprehensive appraisal of the baseline context in which development of the Site would come forward, including the current and emerging policy with regards to sustainable travel; the locational aspects of the site and its immediate surroundings; and finally a bespoke appraisal of the potential sustainable mobility demand. The latter provides a contemporary approach to assessing sustainable travel which seeks to quantify the demand for travel and provides the basis for an efficient and effective set of sustainable travel interventions that can most appropriately secure the policy objectives.
- 9.1.3 Those policy objectives are clear, both at a national and local level, that there should be a reemphasis on promoting highly sustainable development and a shift from conventional practices of predicting traffic demand and providing highway infrastructure accordingly. This policy context invites developments in highly sustainable locations to maximise the opportunities to use non-car modes and to reduce focus on addressing potential vehicle traffic implications. Such traffic constraints are typically inherent in the most sustainable locations, simply because they include a wide range of key services which attract demand from a wider area. So in this respect it would be counterproductive to avoid placing development in these most sustainable locations due to perceived traffic constraints.
- 9.1.4 The proposed Site N1 allocation is a clear example of this. As detailed in this report, the site has an exceptionally sustainable location, within walking distance of Canterbury city centre with access to the extensive ranges of services this entails, including education (from primary through to higher), health care, retail, employment and leisure. A detailed audit identifies localised constraints and opportunities for improvement, but these do not detract materially from the exceptional opportunity provided by the site.
- 9.1.5 Given the above, it is therefore unsurprising that a detailed appraisal of the travel patterns associated with potential development of the site suggest an opportunity to deliver exemplar development - where a significant majority of all travel demand activity can be conducted by sustainable travel modes. The analysis demonstrates that even when applying reasonable limitations to the use of sustainable modes of travel, up to 78% of those trips which would conventionally be assumed to travel by car could instead make use of existing sustainable modes, including the apparent active travel opportunities into and around the City of Canterbury.

- 9.1.6 It is the context of this exceptional opportunity that this report sets a highly aspirational transport 'vision'. Key to that vision is taking advantage of the inherent potential in the location and a development of this site to make active travel and other sustainable modes of travel the natural first choices for residents, thus relegating car use.
- 9.1.7 To help achieve this vision, this report builds on the contextual review to provide targeted and efficient sustainable travel interventions, on corridors that have the opportunity to make a significant difference. This would provide clear, deliverable enhancements in accordance with the draft Policy N1 that will maximise the opportunities from the development of the site and set a precedent to broaden the application of such interventions more widely, including to the adjoining Land North of Hollow Lane site.

## **Appendix A    KCC Guidance on Planning Applications**

**To:** Members of the Joint Transportation Board.

**From:** David Brazier, Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport, Kent County Council

**Subject:** Involvement in the highway aspects of planning applications

**Summary:** KCC receives many requests from local Members asking to be kept informed and involved in the highways aspects of planning applications. Whilst KCC recognises Members intent is to understand the impacts and mitigations for planning applications to support their local communities, it is not possible for direct involvement for several reasons which are outlined in this report.

**Recommendation:** The JTB is asked to note the report.

## 1. Involvement in highways aspects of planning applications advisory note

- 1.1 Any pre-application advice is confidential and cannot be disclosed even under a Freedom Of Information request as it can affect the commercial viability of the site.
- 1.2 Once an application is submitted and KCC Highways are consulted officers have a 21-day turnaround time to submit the statutory response. The level of scrutiny that needs to take place on each application and the number of applications received would make any further consultation within this time period untenable.
- 1.3 Any correspondence on the application **must** be made via the Local Planning Authority (LPA). It is not possible for KCC Highways to have external discussions with developers/members of the public/Members or Parish Council's and other local organisations outside of this process.
- 1.4 KCC Highways, as a statutory consultee, need to give a response to the plans that are submitted before them based on the supporting evidence and **unbiased** technical opinion of the Highway Officer.
- 1.5 It is not the position of the Highway Authority to come up with better ideas, suggest alterations or to attempt to change the mindset of a developer who has presented a workable solution whether or not that solution is popular with local residents and businesses. Our response must be based on fact and cannot take account of assumptions or opinions of the local community.
- 1.6 Our responses cannot be influenced by political persuasion.
- 1.7 Our responses to the applications already set out the key impacts and any mitigation proposed, and this response is uploaded to the LPA website for all to see, in advance of the planning committee meeting.

- 1.8 Parish councils and Town councils are consulted at the same time as KCC Highways and all the details are available on the LPA website. Any comments from us can be viewed publicly.
- 1.9 In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework there is a **presumption in favour of development** and it is the duty of KCC Highways to work with the developers to try to ensure that development can proceed.
- 1.10 KCC Highways ensure that development proposals align with both National and KCC Policies and Standards in all highway associated areas.
- 1.11 KCC Highways seek to promote sustainable travel options above that of the private car to offer a mode choice whenever possible.
- 1.12 KCC Highways offer update meetings to KCC Members at least twice per year to discuss the District/Borough Local Plan growth and associated highway infrastructure and any external funding bids.
- 1.13 KCC Highways ensure that any Transport Models used to support a proposal are validated, current and suitable.
- 1.14 KCC Highways will always determine the extent of the area to be covered by a Transport Assessment by scoping out the specific links and junctions on the network that are necessary in order for us to make an informed appraisal.
- 1.15 Mitigation is proposed by the developer for the scrutiny of KCC Highways. The only time a developer might be told what mitigation or contribution **must** be delivered is when the mitigation has been previously agreed as part of a wider District or Borough Transport Strategy and a policy has been attached to an allocated site setting out the infrastructure requirements required for the site to come forward. Such transport strategies and subsequent Infrastructure Delivery Plans will have been previously consulted upon and approved by the District and County Council Members.
- 1.16 KCC Highways Officers are fully aware that most of the allocated sites within a Local Plan, particularly the larger ones, are likely to be unpopular with neighbouring residents, particularly when being built on green space and impacting on views and amenity. Many people hinge their objections on highway impacts because we all use the road network on a daily basis, albeit walking, cycling, driving, by public transport etc. and are familiar with the local junctions and how they operate in peak traffic conditions. What they are often not aware of is that in the vast majority of cases the junctions that they report to be operating above capacity and causing extended queuing are not unusual traffic conditions and these same queues are replicated in exactly the same way in the majority of towns and also some villages across most of Kent and indeed across the country. Most of our network is historic and is constrained by frontage development, conservation and environmental constraints and listed building protection. In view of this it is not always possible to make physical improvements by expanding the road space to create more room to allow cars to travel through junctions more quickly. Often when these improvements are

carried out and the network operates better in a particular area, other traffic then assigns to the improved route and the former scenario quickly resumes.

- 1.17 KCC Highways, where possible, are not now looking to amend the network to accommodate more cars. Instead, they are looking to see how people could travel more sustainably from new development sites and are asking developers to provide the infrastructure to make this happen. This is known as “Vision and validate” or “decide and provide” as opposed to the former use of “predict and provide” which always looked at the worst-case future year scenario and tried to adjust the network to cope with it. The hope is that in the future it will be more inviting and easier to walk and cycle short trips than to use the private car and that public transport will be more accessible with reliable journey times.
- 1.18 KCC Highways officers appreciate that Members are trying hard to support their constituents by trying to change or prevent certain development proposals and its associated network changes but ultimately if a site has been allocated it needs to happen and KCC Highways will always work hard to ensure that the best possible outcome is achieved in terms of minimising highway impacts, promoting sustainability, and creating a sense of place. Inspectors are routinely approving appeals in favour of development. Congestion, journey time reliability and extended queuing are not often being upheld as reasons to refuse development. The only realistic chance of an appeal being upheld on highway grounds is if highway safety is directly compromised and this has to be robustly evidenced.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The JTB is asked to note the report.

## **3. Contract Details**

David Brazier  
Kent County Council  
Cabinet Member, Highways & Transport

## **Appendix B Existing Sustainable Travel Networks**

**KEY**


- Signed on-road cycle route
- Traffic-free - Surfaced  
Includes Bridleways, Restricted Byways and Byways Open to All Traffic
- Traffic-free - Unsurfaced  
Includes Bridleways, Restricted Byways and Byways Open to All Traffic
- Unsigned routes - useful to link up your cycle journey
- Promoted route - on-road \*
- Promoted route off-road - surfaced \*
- \* Guides available for download from [explorekent.org](http://explorekent.org)
- Pedestrianised roads  
Cycling permitted outside the hours of 10.30-16.00
- Footpath
- North Downs Way National Trail
- School  
Named and numbered
- Place of interest  
Named and numbered
- Bus stop
- Hospital
- Visitor Information
- Bus Station
- Railway with station
- Level crossing
- Toucan crossing
- Pelican crossing
- Zebra crossing
- Bike shop
- Electric Vehicle Charging Point
- National / Regional Cycle Network route number
- Step-free access to both platforms at railway stations
- Toilets
- Cycle parking
- Cycle lockers
- In the city centre area cycle parking and toilet facilities are only shown on inset map overleaf



**CYCLE TO SCHOOL**

- S1 Blean Primary School
- S2 The Archbishops School
- S3 St Stephens Junior School
- S4 St Stephens Infant School
- S5 Parkside Community Primary School
- S6 St Johns C of E Primary School
- S7 St Thomas Catholic Primary School, Canterbury
- S8 St Peters Methodist Primary School, Canterbury
- S9 Barton Court Grammar School
- S10 Pilgrims Way Primary School
- S11 Simon Langton Girls Grammar School
- S12 St Anselms Catholic School, Canterbury
- S13 Simon Langton Grammar School for Boys
- S14 St Nicholas School
- S15 The Orchard School
- S16 Wincheap Foundation Primary School
- S17 East Kent Health Needs Education Service
- S18 The Canterbury Primary School
- S19 The Canterbury Academy

# Main Bus Routes in Canterbury



**uni bus** The University of Kent is served by frequent buses.

**uni 1** Direct between the Uni and City Centre.

**uni 2** Between Hales Place, Uni, St Dunstan's West Station and City Centre.

**5** to/from Whitstable & Seasalter

**400 401** to/from Whitstable

**600 601 602** to/from Herne Bay

**8** to/from Thanet

**3 X3** to/from Faversham, Sittingbourne & Maidstone


**43** to/from Sandwich

### KEY Main Bus Service Routes

<b>1A 1X</b> about every hour (every 30 mins to Chartham)	<b>25</b> up to every 10 minutes (Mon - Fri)	Other / Combined Routes
<b>3 X3</b> every 30 minutes	<b>400 401</b> every 30 minutes	<b>P&amp;R</b> Park & Ride site
<b>21 21A</b> up to every 20 minutes	<b>600 601</b> every 30 minutes	Railway line and Station
<b>22</b> up to every 15 minutes	<b>602</b> every 60 minutes	Hospital
<b>23</b> every 20 minutes		
<b>23A</b> every 60 minutes		

An approximate guide to Mon - Sat daytime frequencies which may vary particularly at school peak time.

# Southeastern network map



## Appendix C Active Travel Audit



13

7

11

3

6

8

4

2

1

5

9

10

12

0 1 km



**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Wincheap Homersham Lane
Length	630m
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	12
Directness	6
Safety	4
Coherence	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

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

22-022 Merton Park

**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</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>8</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>12</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>2</b>		
<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>0</b>		
<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>0</b>		
<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>0</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>6</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>1</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>4</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>0</b>	Within industrial estate itself, dropped kerbs and tactile paving over drives is lacking	
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>0</b>		
				<b>Total Score</b>	<b>30</b>	

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Wincheap Hollow Lane
Length	680m
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	11
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Spilt paint etc. roadworks at time of survey in Wincheap estate, 'looks' industrial and not attractive for retail	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>7</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>1</b>	Footways cracked and not always level, e.g Cow Lane, Hollow Lane	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>11</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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>10</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>6</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>0</b>	Within industrial estate itself, dropped kerbs and tactile paving over drives is lacking	
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>0</b>		
			<b>Total Score</b>	<b>34</b>		

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Canterbury City Centre
Length	1.6km
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	8
Directness	9
Safety	4
Coherence	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Wincheap Roundabout is extremely busy	
<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>2</b>		
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>7</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>1</b>	Large puddles, uneven footways, transitions across drives are not smooth/ many surface types used on Stour St	
<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>1</b>	Occasional need on Stour St	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>0</b>		
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>8</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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Subways partially divert 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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>0</b>	The subways can get confusing - difficult to always see where you are going to come out (particularly as traffic blocks visibility)	
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>9</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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Some of footways on lanes on way to City Centre are narrow and close to traffic (but low traffic volumes)	
<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>1</b>	Traffic on Wincheap roundabout blocks visibility of route	
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>4</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>0</b>	Several instances on Stour St/Castle St without dropped kerbs	
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>0</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>28</b>		

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Canterbury East Station
Length	500m
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	3
Comfort	6
Directness	12
Safety	6
Coherence	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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>1</b>		
<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>0</b>		
<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>1</b>	Wincheap Roundabout is extremely busy - front access	
<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>1</b>	Lack of lighting rear entrance	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>3</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>0</b>	Large puddles, uneven footways to rear	
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Gradient to front entrance	
<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>0</b>		
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>6</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>12</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>6</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>2</b>		
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>2</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>29</b>		

## ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	St Nicholas School
Length	450m
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	9
Directness	12
Safety	3
Coherence	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

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

22-022 Merton Park

#### 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</b>		
<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>1</b>	Stuppington Lane is rural and not overlooked	
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Beginning of route on Stuppington Lane lacks lighting	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>6</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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	No footways on Stuppington Lane	Off site - footway/crossing leading from Stuppington Rd to George Roche Rd
<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>1</b>	There are no formal crossing points on the route but traffic levels are very low and largely residential	
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>9</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>	No formal crossings	
<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>2</b>	No formal crossings but traffic levels are likely to be low enough, and visibility high enough, that pedestrians will be able to cross at their leisure	
<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>2</b>	No formal crossings	
<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>2</b>	No formal crossings	
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>12</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>2</b>		
<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>0</b>	Pedestrians must walk in road on Stuppington Lane	
<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>1</b>	Low visibility on Stuppington Lane around bends	
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>3</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>0</b>		
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>0</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>30</b>		

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Canterbury SE Bridge St
Length	2km
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	6
Comfort	10
Directness	7
Safety	4
Coherence	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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</b>		
<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>1</b>	Surveillance on Biggleswade Passage is limited up to A28 Wincheap Rd	
<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>1</b>	Roads are busy but traffic slowish moving	
<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>2</b>	Lighting on Biggleswade Passage is limited	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>6</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>1</b>	Biggleswade Passage surfacing could be improved (adj to Norfolk Rd)	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Gradient on St Peters Place	
<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>2</b>		
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>10</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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Some crossings divert from desire lines e.g. zebra crossings to sainsburys local (Victoria Court)	
<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>0</b>	Subways	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>0</b>	The subways can get confusing - difficult to always see where you are going to come out (particularly as traffic blocks visibility)	
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>7</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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Traffic on Wincheap roundabout blocks visibility of route	
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>4</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>2</b>		
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>2</b>		
				<b>Total Score</b>	<b>29</b>	

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Barracks
Length	3km
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	9
Directness	12
Safety	5
Coherence	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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</b>		
<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>1</b>	The barracks are not very welcoming, some vandalism etc.	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>7</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>1</b>	Footways in good condition until the residential area in which the barracks lie - footways become cracked and uneven	
<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>1</b>	Occasional narrowing due to bollards and bridge on Nunnery Fields	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Bins causing obstruction on footways Large areas of ponding e.g. junction of Nunnery Fields and Old Dover Road	
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>9</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>12</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>1</b>	Traffic volumes on Old Dover Road and Nunnery Fields are moderate and pedestrians in	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>5</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>2</b>	Stuppington Lane would benefit from crossing at junction with S Canterbury Rd	
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>2</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>35</b>		

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Barton Court Grammar School
Length	1.7km
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	8
Directness	11
Safety	6
Coherence	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Bollards and bins/refuse sacks	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>7</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>1</b>	Paving cracked and uneven in places (Upper Chantry Lane)	
<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>1</b>	Occasional narrowing due to bollards and bridge on Nunnery Fields	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>1</b>	Bins causing obstruction on footways	
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>8</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>11</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>6</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>1</b>	Stuppington Lane would benefit from crossing at junction with S Canterbury Rd	
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>1</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>33</b>		

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Old Dover Road (Sainsbury's Local)
Length	1.6km
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	11
Directness	10
Safety	4
Coherence	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and</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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>7</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>1</b>	Some dropped kerbs/crossovers uneven e.g. Ethelbert Road, over driveways etc.	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>11</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>1</b>	At the junction of Old Dover Road and Ethelbert Road, there is no crossing and the footpath ends. The junction is busy and quite difficult to cross if you want to go right to the supermarket	
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>10</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>1</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>4</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>2</b>		
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>2</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>34</b>		

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

<b>Route Name</b>	Simon Langton Girls Grammar
<b>Length</b>	2.2km
<b>Name of Assessor(s)</b>	OM
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	11
Directness	10
Safety	3
Coherence	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>

<b>Comments</b>	0
<b>Actions</b>	0

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

22-022 Merton Park

**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</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>7</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>1</b>	Some dropped kerbs/crossovers uneven e.g. Ethelbert Road, over driveways etc.	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>11</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>1</b>	At the junction of Old Dover Road and Ethelbert Road, there is no crossing and the footpath ends. The junction is busy and quite difficult to cross if you want to go right to the school	
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>10</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>1</b>	Traffic volume at PM school leaving was relatively high but slow moving, and pedestrian	
<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>1</b>		
<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>1</b>	During PM school leaving time, traffic was heavy and crossing the road (not using ped crossing point) was difficult.	
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>3</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>2</b>		
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>2</b>		
			<b>Total Score</b>	<b>33</b>		

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	The Rosewood School
Length	2.6km
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	4
Comfort	8
Directness	12
Safety	5
Coherence	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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>1</b>		
<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>1</b>	Surveillance on Biggleswade Passage is limited up to A28 Wincheap Rd	
<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>1</b>	Route along busy main road (A290)	
<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>1</b>	Lighting on Biggleswade Passage is limited	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>4</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>0</b>	Uneven paths, significant flooding in some areas and splashing by cars, missing footway outside school which turns to mud / requires crossing to other side Biggleswade Passage surfacing could be improved	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>0</b>	Large areas of insurpassable flooding e.g on Rheims Way, mud encroaching onto foot/cycleway	
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>8</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>2</b>	Could be more direct route to school but the railway track requires diversion	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>12</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>1</b>	Traffic volumes generally high and pooling water on carriageway can cause	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>5</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>2</b>		
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>2</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>31</b>		

## ROUTE SUMMARY

Route Name	Simon Langton Boys Grammar
Length	850m
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	11
Directness	12
Safety	6
Coherence	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

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

22-022 Merton Park

#### 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.	2		
<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).	0	Route is very isolated and not overlooked by any dwelling	
<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	2		
<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			1	No streetlighting and generally isolated, but separate from traffic	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>5</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.	2		
<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.	2		
<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.	2		
<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.	2		
<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).	2		
<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			1	Some sections of mud and leaf litter	
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>11</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.	2		
<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.	2		
<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).	2		
<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.	2		
<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.	2		
<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.			2		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>12</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.	2		
<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.	2		
<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.	2		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>6</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.	2		
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>2</b>		
				<b>Total Score</b>	<b>36</b>	

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	University of Kent
Length	4km
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	5
Comfort	7
Directness	10
Safety	4
Coherence	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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</b>		
<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>1</b>	Surveillance on Biggleswade Passage is limited up to A28 Wincheap Rd	
<b>3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and</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>1</b>		
<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>1</b>	Lighting on Biggleswade Passage is limited Shop signs placed outside Bins placed on street	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>5</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>1</b>	Biggleswade Passage surfacing could be improved (adj to Norfolk Rd)	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>0</b>	Whistable Road is steep towards the university	
<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>0</b>	Large areas of insurpassable flooding e.g on Rheims Way, mud encroaching onto foot/cycleway	
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>7</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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Zebra crossing at 40 Acres Road and Station Road + pelican into town centre slightly diverted from desire line	
<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>1</b>	There is a train crossing on Whistable Road - pedestrians can use a subway beneath the track	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>10</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>1</b>	Whistable Road towards Canterbury town centre has moderate traffic including	
<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>1</b>	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians can come into close contact when navigating obstacles	
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>4</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>1</b>	Dropped kerbs could be improved along Whistable Road e.g. Whistable Road to 40 Acres Road jct	
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>1</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>27</b>		

**ROUTE SUMMARY**

Route Name	Canterbury NW North Lane
Length	1.5km
Name of Assessor(s)	OM
Date of Assessment	05 February 2024

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	7
Comfort	10
Directness	12
Safety	5
Coherence	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>

Comments	0
Actions	0

**Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool**  
Walking Route Audit Tool

22-022 Merton Park

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</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Bollards and bins/refuse sacks	
<b>ATTRACTIVENESS</b>				<b>7</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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Occasional narrowing due to bollards and bridge on Nunnery Fields	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>1</b>	Bins causing obstruction on footways Large areas of ponding e.g. junction of Nunnery Fields and Old Dover Road	
<b>COMFORT</b>				<b>10</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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>DIRECTNESS</b>				<b>12</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>1</b>	Traffic volumes on Old Dover Road and Nunnery Fields are moderate and pedestrians in	
<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>2</b>		
<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>2</b>		
<b>SAFETY</b>				<b>5</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>2</b>	Stuppington Lane would benefit from crossing at junction with S Canterbury Rd	
<b>COHERENCE</b>				<b>2</b>		
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>36</b>		

## Appendix D Modal Share Summary

\*Information as found in 22-022-EXL-018

Table 1

Bus 2	BS Triangle
	BS 3
	BS 5
	BS 6
	BS 8A/ 8 Breeze
	BS 12/15/16
	BS 43
	various
Bus 1	BS 1A
	BS 1X
Rail 1	Cant E - London Victoria
	Cant E - Dover Priory
Rail 2	Cant W - Lnd St Pancras
	Cant W - Lnd Charing Cross
	Cant W - Ramsgate
	Cant W - Margate

Train Services and Stations				
Cant E - London Victoria	Cant E - Dover Priory	Cant W - Lnd St Pancras	Cant W - Lnd Charing Cross	Cant W - Margate
Selling	Bekesbourne	Ashford International	Chartham	Sturry
Faversham	Adisham	Ebbsfleet International	Chilham	Minster
Teynham	Aylesham	Stratford International	Wye	Thanet Parkway
Sittingbourne	Snowdown	London St Pancras	Ashford International	Ramsgate
Newington	Shepherds Well		etc	Broadstairs
etc	Kearsney (Kent)		London Bridge	Margate
London Victoria	Dover Priory			

Table 2

Routes Audited

Route No	Route Name
1	Wincheap industrial through Homersham - Morrisons Route
2	Wincheap industrial through Hollow Lane - Cow Lane Route
3	Canterbury Centre through Biggleswade Passage, Church Lane, Stour St.
4	Canterbury East station through Lime Kiln Road
5	St Nicholas School
6	Canterbury Centre - East through Old Dover Road
7	Barracks through Old Dover Rd/ Military Rd
8	Barton Court Grammar through Lower Chantry Ln/ Longport
9	Old Dover Road through Etherbert Rd
10	Simon Langton Girls through Etherbert Rd
11	The Rosewood School
12	Simon Langton Boys
13	University of Kent (north of city)

Zone Location	Zone ID	Name	Sustainable Alternative	Most Attractive Route	Maximum Potential	Merton Park Arrivals		Merton Park Departures		Total Flows in Both Peaks	Merton Park Sust. Arrivals		Merton Park Sust. Departures		Merton Park Veh. Arrivals		Merton Park Veh. Departures		
						AM	PM	AM	PM		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	
						204	406	409	294		Absolute	%	139	307	323	218	65	99	86
Chilham/ Godmersham	101001	Ashford 001B	Y	Cant W - Lnd St Pancras	100%	3	7	8	8	26	2.0%	3	7	8	8	0	0	0	0
Chilham/ Godmersham	101002	Ashford 001C	Y	Cant W - Lnd St Pancras	100%	4	15	18	13	50	3.8%	4	15	18	13	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre	102001	Canterbury 001A	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	1	1	0	1	0.1%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre	102002	Canterbury 001B	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre	102003	Canterbury 001C	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre	102004	Canterbury 001D	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre	102005	Canterbury 001E	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay East	102006	Canterbury 002A	Y	BS 6	100%	1	1	0	0	2	0.2%	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay East	102007	Canterbury 002B	Y	BS 6	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay East	102008	Canterbury 002C	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay East	102009	Canterbury 002D	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre-west	102010	Canterbury 003A	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	1	2	1	4	0.3%	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre-west	102011	Canterbury 003B	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre-west	102012	Canterbury 003C	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre-west	102013	Canterbury 003D	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay Centre-west	102014	Canterbury 003E	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable East	102015	Canterbury 004A	Y	BS 5	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay West	102016	Canterbury 004B	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay West	102017	Canterbury 004C	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay West	102018	Canterbury 004D	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay West	102019	Canterbury 004E	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable East	102020	Canterbury 005A	Y	BS 5	100%	0	0	1	0	1	0.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable East	102021	Canterbury 005B	Y	BS 5	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable East	102022	Canterbury 005C	Y	BS 5	100%	0	1	1	0	2	0.2%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable East	102023	Canterbury 005D	Y	BS 5	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable East	102024	Canterbury 005E	Y	BS 5	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay South	102025	Canterbury 006A	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	1	1	1	2	0.2%	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay South	102026	Canterbury 006B	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay South	102027	Canterbury 006C	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay South	102028	Canterbury 006D	Y	BS Triangle	100%	1	0	0	1	3	0.2%	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Herne Bay South	102029	Canterbury 006E	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	1	1	0.1%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre	102030	Canterbury 007A	Y	BS 5	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre	102031	Canterbury 007B	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre	102032	Canterbury 007C	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre	102033	Canterbury 007D	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre	102034	Canterbury 007E	Y	BS 5	100%	0	0	1	0	1	0.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre-West	102035	Canterbury 008A	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre-West	102036	Canterbury 008B	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre-West	102037	Canterbury 008C	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre-West	102038	Canterbury 008D	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable Centre-West	102039	Canterbury 008E	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable West	102040	Canterbury 009A	Y	BS 5	100%	0	1	1	1	2	0.2%	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Whitstable West	102041	Canterbury 009B	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable West	102042	Canterbury 009C	N	-	0%	0	0	1	1	2	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Whitstable West	102043	Canterbury 009D	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitstable West	102044	Canterbury 009E	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East of Sturry_Littlebourne/Wickambreaux	102046	Canterbury 010B	Y	8	100%	0	1	2	2	7	0.5%	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0
East of Sturry	102047	Canterbury 010C	Y	BS 8A/ 8 Breeze	100%	1	1	1	1	4	0.3%	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
East of Sturry	102048	Canterbury 010D	Y	BS 8A/ 8 Breeze	100%	0	2	2	2	7	0.5%	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
South West limit_Chartham S	102073	Canterbury 017A	Y	1	100%	6	14	14	15	48	3.7%	6	14	14	15	0	0	0	0
South West limit_Chartham S	102075	Canterbury 017C	Y	1	100%	3	7	7	7	24	1.8%	3	7	7	7	0	0	0	0
	102077	Canterbury 018A	Y	BS 12/15/16	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South East limit	102078	Canterbury 018B	Y	BS 12/15/16	100%	3	4	2	2	11	0.8%	3	4	2	2	0	0	0	0
South East limit_Bridge/Bishopsbourne	102080	Canterbury 018D	Y	10	100%	1	6	4	4	15	1.2%	1	6	4	4	0	0	0	0
Southeast off Faversham_Selling	108082	Swale 017A	Y	Cant E - London Victoria	100%	0	1	1	0	3	0.2%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Southeast off Faversham_Graveney	108083	Swale 017B	N	-	0%	0	1	1	0	2	0.1%	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Southeast off Faversham_Boughton Street	108084	Swale 017C	Y	BS 3	100%	0	1	1	0	2	0.2%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Southeast off Faversham_Dunkirk	108085	Swale 017D	Y	BS 3	100%	0	2	2	1	6	0.5%	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
New Dover Road	118747	E00122074	Y	10	100%	0	2	5	1	8	0.6%	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0
St Martin's	118748	E00122075	Y	8	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ivy Lane	118749	E00122076	Y	8	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
East of Broad Street	118750	E00122077	Y	7	100%	0	0	4	1	5	0.4%	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0
Barton Manor School	118751	E00122078	Y	8	100%	0	1	8	3	12	0.9%	0	1	8	3	0	0	0	0
Canterbury College	118752	E00122080	Y	8	100%	0	1	26	3	30	2.3%	0	1	26	3	0	0	0	0

Littlebourne Rd N/ Stormash Rd W	118753	E00122082	Y	8	100%	0	0	5	3	9	0.7%	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0
Warwick Road	118754	E00122083	Y	8	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sussex Avenue	118755	E00122084	Y	8	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Dover Road	118756	E00122085	Y	6	100%	3	15	0	1	19	1.4%	3	15	0	1	0	0	0	0
Russet Rd	118757	E00122086	Y	8	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St Augustine's Rd	118758	E00122087	Y	8	100%	0	1	0	1	2	0.1%	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Old Dover Rd North	118759	E00122088	Y	6	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Old Dover Rd/Cossington Rd	118760	E00122089	Y	6	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pilgrims Way Primary School	118761	E00122090	Y	10	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rochester Ave	118762	E00122091	Y	10	100%	3	7	0	0	11	0.8%	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Spitfire Ground, St Lawrence	118763	E00122092	Y	10	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milton Cl	118764	E00122093	Y	10	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Simon Langton Girls' Hospital	118765	E00122094	Y	10	100%	0	2	0	0	2	0.1%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hospital	118766	E00122095	Y	12	100%	0	2	26	5	33	2.5%	0	2	26	5	0	0	0	0
New Dover Rd P&R	118767	E00122096	Y	10	100%	0	2	9	2	14	1.1%	0	2	9	2	0	0	0	0
Bekesbourne Ln	118768	E00122097	Y	10	100%	0	1	0	2	2	0.2%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
Legacy Park Viewpoint	118769	E00122098	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118770	E00122099	Y	7	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118771	E00122100	Y	8	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118772	E00122101	Y	8	100%	3	8	0	0	10	0.8%	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118773	E00122102	Y	various	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118774	E00122103	Y	various	100%	0	0	4	0	5	0.3%	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
	118775	E00122105	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118776	E00122106	Y	BS Triangle	100%	1	3	0	0	5	0.4%	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118777	E00122107	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118778	E00122110	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118779	E00122111	Y	BS Triangle	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shalmsford Street	118780	E00122112	Y	BS 1A	100%	2	3	0	1	5	0.4%	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0
Shalmsford Street	118781	E00122114	Y	BS 1A	100%	1	2	0	1	4	0.3%	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Beech Ave	118785	E00122118	Y		100%	0	2	0	0	2	0.1%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118786	E00122119	Y		100%	0	1	0	1	2	0.1%	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
	118787	E00122120	Y	BS 1A	100%	0	1	0	0	2	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118788	E00122121	Y	BS 1A	100%	0	1	0	2	4	0.3%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
	118790	E00122123	Y	1	100%	1	2	3	1	6	0.5%	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0
	118857	E00122192	Y	1	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118858	E00122193	Y	1	100%	0	1	0	2	3	0.2%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
	118859	E00122194	Y	13	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118860	E00122195	Y	11	100%	0	1	0	1	2	0.1%	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
	118861	E00122196	Y	13	100%	0	0	0	1	1	0.1%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	118862	E00122197	Y	13	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118863	E00122198	Y	13	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118864	E00122199	Y	11	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118865	E00122200	Y	11	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118942	E00122277	Y	8	100%	0	0	0	1	1	0.1%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Littlebourne	118945	E00122280	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Littlebourne	118946	E00122281	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Littlebourne centre	118948	E00122283	Y	BS 43	100%	1	1	0	0	2	0.1%	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bekesbourne	118960	E00122296	Y	-	100%	0	1	0	2	3	0.2%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
Patricxbourne	118961	E00122297	N	-	0%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	118965	E00122301	Y	9	100%	0	1	4	2	6	0.5%	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0
	118966	E00122302	Y	9	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bridge	118967	E00122303	Y	9	100%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118968	E00122305	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118969	E00122306	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118970	E00122307	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118971	E00122308	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118972	E00122309	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118973	E00122310	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118974	E00122311	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118975	E00122312	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118976	E00122313	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118977	E00122314	Y	7	100%	0	0	1	0	1	0.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	118978	E00122315	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118979	E00122316	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118980	E00122317	Y	7	100%	0	0	1	0	2	0.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	118981	E00122318	Y	7	100%	5	10	0	0	15	1.2%	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118982	E00122319	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	1	1	0.1%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	118983	E00122320	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118984	E00122321	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	118985	E00122322	Y	7	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	119012	E00122350	Y	7	100%	0	0	3	0	3	0.2%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0







	600011	Land at Golden Hill	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	600012	Land on western side of	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	600013	Land at Cooting Farm	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	600014	Land West and East of C	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	600015	Land On the South East	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	600016	Aylesham South	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	600017	Bekesbourne Farm	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	600018	Land off the Hill, Littleb	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	700000	Canterbury Business Pa	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	700001	Bodkin Farm	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	700002	Land at Greenhill adja	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	700003	Altira	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	700004	Hawthorn Corner	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	700005	Broad Oak Reservoir	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1407335	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1433839	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1438293	External	N	-	0%	6	23	15	9	52	4.0%	0	0	0	0	6	23	15	9
	1438916	External	N	-	0%	1	2	2	2	7	0.5%	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2
	1438920	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dover bound	1439001	External	Y	Cant E - Dover Priory	0%	0	0	39	49	88	6.7%	0	0	39	49	0	0	0	0
	1439299	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1441044	External	N	-	0%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Olantigh Rd - towards Wye	1451862	External	Y	Cant W - Lnd Charing Cross	0%	0	2	3	2	8	0.6%	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0
	1465813	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A2 West	1465833	External	Y	Cant E - London Victoria	0%	3	8	6	3	20	1.5%	3	8	6	3	0	0	0	0
	1465954	External	N	-	0%	6	7	5	4	22	1.6%	0	0	0	0	6	7	5	4
	1466119	External	N	-	0%	0	0	3	2	5	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
Dover originated	1474111	External	Y	Cant E - Dover Priory	0%	63	54	0	0	118	9.0%	63	54	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1474323	External	N	-	0%	1	3	2	6	13	1.0%	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	6
	1482214	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1495636	External	N	-	0%	2	1	1	2	6	0.5%	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2
	1495703	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1497985	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1500279	External	N	-	0%	5	11	17	12	46	3.5%	0	0	0	0	5	11	17	12
	1502864	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1510157	External	N	-	0%	21	11	3	6	40	3.0%	0	0	0	0	21	11	3	6
	1510363	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1514647	External	N	-	0%	7	15	8	7	38	2.9%	0	0	0	0	7	15	8	7
	1524898	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1524972	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1525107	External	N	-	0%	4	2	1	2	9	0.7%	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	2
	1532329	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1533355	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1536819	External	N	-	0%	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	1536900	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1536903	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1572893	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1572984	External	N	-	0%	4	4	2	3	13	1.0%	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3
	1572986	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1573023	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1573031	External	N	-	0%	4	12	20	15	52	3.9%	0	0	0	0	4	12	20	15
	1574989	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1579423	External	N	-	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A28 towards Ashford	1584102	External	Y	Cant W - Lnd Charing Cross	0%	8	24	30	22	85	6.5%	8	24	30	22	0	0	0	0
	1584103	External	N	-	0%	0	0	1	0	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	1600173	External	N	-	0%	2	2	0	0	4	0.3%	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
London Bound	1600178	External	Y	Cant W - Lnd St Pancras	0%	3	9	0	0	12	0.9%	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coming from London	1600179	External	Y	Cant W - Lnd St Pancras	0%	0	0	12	5	17	1.3%	0	0	12	5	0	0	0	0

## Appendix E Site Access Gateways

NOTES

List of Access Points

1. Hollow Lane
2. Footpath by Hollow Lane
3. Footpath to Victoria Road
4. Lime Kiln Road
5. Stuppington Lane (north)
6. Cycleway
7. Bus Gate
8. Langton Lane
9. Nackington Road
10. Stuppington Lane (south)

C	Latest Reg 18	CG	CG	JW	Oct 25
B	Updated the labels and drawing title	DA	CG	JW	May 24
A	Updated to suite latest design	GW	AT	JW	May 23
Rev	Amendments	Drm	Chk	App	Date



Issued by

Landmark House  
 Station Road  
 Hook  
 Hampshire  
 RG27 9JA  
 01256 630420

enquiries@c-a.uk.com  
 www.c-a.uk.com

Park House  
 Park Farm  
 East Malling Trust Estate  
 Bradbourne Lane  
 Aylesford  
 Kent  
 ME20 6SN  
 01732 448120

Job Title

**Merton Park,  
Canterbury**

Drawing Title

**Multimodal Access**

Client

**Quinn Estates**

Scale	Date	Designed
1:5000 @ A1	March 2023	DA

Drawn	Checked	Approved
DA	SW	JW

Job No	Drawing No	Rev
22-022	22-022/015	C



**CANTERBURY CITY  
CENTRE**

**SOUTH  
CANTERBURY  
ROAD**

**KENT AND  
CANTERBURY HOSPITAL**

**MERTON  
PARK**

**HOLLOW  
LANE**

**STUPPINGTON  
LANE**

**A2**

**MERTON  
LANE**

**IFFIN  
LANE**

**NACKINGTON  
ROAD**











**A2 to Dover**

**Key**

Bus  Motor Vehicles  
 Pedestrian  Cycle



## Appendix F Active Travel Improvements



Issued by  Landmark House, Station Road, Hook, Hampshire, RG27 9HA, 01256 630420

Park House, Park Farm, East Malling Trust Estate, Broadbourne Lane, Aylesford Kent ME20 6SN, 01732 448120

**Charles & Associates**

**NOTES**

KEY:

- HIGHWAY BOUNDARY AS PER KCC RECORDS
- EXISTING PROW PATHS
- SITE BOUNDARY
- EXISTING STREET LIGHTING COLUMNS

Rev	Amendments	Dm	Chk	App	Date
-----	------------	----	-----	-----	------



Job Title: Merton Park, Canterbury

Drawing Title: Proposed Stuppington Lane Mixed Use Facilities

Client: Quinn Estates

Scale: As Shown@A1	Date: Jan 25	Designed: DH
Drawn: DH	Checked: CG	Approved: JW
Job No: 22-022	Drawing No: 22-022/042	Rev: -



SEE INSET DRAWING 22-022-044 FOR CONTINUATION



**NOTES**

KEY:

- HIGHWAY BOUNDARY AS PER KCC RECORDS
- SITE BOUNDARY
- EXISTING PRoW PATHS
- ⊙ EXISTING STREET LIGHTING COLUMN



Rev	Amendments	Dm	Chk	App	Date

**Charles & Associates**

Landmark House  
Station Road  
Hook  
Hampshire  
RG27 9HA  
01256 638420  
enquiries@ca-uk.com  
www.ca-uk.com

Issued by: [Signature]

Park House  
Park Farm  
East Malling Trust Estate  
Bradbourne Lane  
Aylshford Kent  
ME20 6SN  
01732 448120

Job Title



**Merton Park, Canterbury**

Drawing Title  
**Proposed Lime Kiln Road Mixed Use Scheme - Sh 1 of 3**

Client  
**Quinn Estates**

Scale 1:250 @ A1	Date Jan 2025	Designed DH
Drawn DH	Checked CG	Approved JW
Job No 22-022	Drawing No 22-022-043	Rev -

SEE INSET DRAWING 22-022-045 FOR CONTINUATION



NOTES

A Further enhancements to Lime Kiln Road		CG	CG	JW	Mar 25
Rev	Amendments	Dm	Chk	App	Date

**Charles & Associates**



Issued by: [Signature]

Landmark House  
Station Road  
Hook  
Hampshire  
RG27 9HA  
01256 639429  
enquiries@ca.co.uk  
www.ca.co.uk

Park Farm  
Park Farm  
East Malling Trust Estate  
Bradbourne Lane  
Aylesford Kent  
ME20 6SN  
01732 448129

Job Title		
Merton Park, Canterbury		
Drawing Title		
Proposed Lime Kiln Road Mixed Use Scheme - Sh 2 of 3		
Client		
Quinn Estates		
Scale	Date	Designed
1:250 @ A1	Jan 2025	DH
Drawn	Checked	Approved
DH	CG	JW
Job No	Drawing No	Rev
22-022	22-022-044	A

SEE INSET DRAWING 22-022-043 FOR CONTINUATION



**NOTES**

KEY:

- HIGHWAY BOUNDARY AS PER KCC RECORDS
- SITE BOUNDARY
- EXISTING PROW PATHS
- EXISTING STREET LIGHTING COLUMN

Rev	Amendments	Drn	Chk	App	Date

**Charles & Associates**

Landmark House  
Station Road  
Hook  
Hampshire  
RG27 9HA  
01256 638420  
enquiries@c-a.co.uk  
www.c-a.co.uk

Issued by

Park House  
Park Farm  
East Malling Trust Estate  
Bradbourne Lane  
Aylesford Kent  
ME20 6SN  
01732 448120

Job Title


**Merton Park,  
Canterbury**

Client

**Quinn Estates**

Scale	Date	Designed
1:500 @ A1	Jan 2025	DH
Drawn	Checked	Approved
DH	CG	JW
Job No	Drawing No	Rev
22-022	22-022-045	-

SEE INSET DRAWING 22-022-044 FOR CONTINUATION



Existing ProW Code CC52. See image above for connection to Wincheap.



Existing ProW Code CC52. See image below for connection to south.



Proposed signage for pedestrian route connecting to Wincheap. See image below for existing facilities.



See image below for existing ped/cycle facilities along Hope Garden Way.




Existing ProW Code CC52 to be upgraded with environmental improvements. See image below for existing ProW facilities & image to right for potential lighting & surfacing improvements.



Existing ProW Code CC52 to be upgraded with improved surfacing and lighting features. See image below for existing ProW facilities.



See image below for existing ped/cycle facilities from Wincheap to the south.



KEY PLAN - NTS

**NOTES**

KEY:

- HIGHWAY BOUNDARY AS PER KCC RECORDS
- SITE BOUNDARY
- EXISTING PROW PATHS
- EXISTING STREET LIGHTING COLUMN

**Charles & Associates**

Issued by: [Signature]


**Merton Park, Canterbury**

**Victoria Road Proposed Pedestrian Improvements**

Client: **Quinn Estates**


Scale: 1:250 @ A1	Date: Jan 2025	Designed: DH
Drawn: DH	Checked: CG	Approved: JW
Job No: 22-022	Drawing No: 22-022-046	Rev: -

## Appendix G Overall Bus Strategy



- NOTES**
- KEY:**
- DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES
  - PROPOSED BUS ROUTE
  - PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CONNECTIONS
  - EXISTING PrOw - FOOTPATH
  - EXISTING PrOw - BRIDLEWAY
  - EXISTING PrOw - BYWAY
  - EXISTING CYCLE ROUTES
  - EXISTING RAILWAY LINE
  - EXISTING BUS ROUTES
  - EXISTING BUS STOPS

- Modes of Transport at Access Points to Site**
- Bus
  - Motor Vehicles
  - Pedestrian
  - Cycle



Rev	Description	By	Date
A	Latest Pentland schemes	DH	CG
	Amendments	Drn	Chk
		App	Date

**Charles & Associates**

Landmark House  
Station Road  
Heak  
Hampshire  
RG27 9BA  
01264 638420

enquiries@cc-a.co.uk  
www.cc-a.co.uk


Park House  
Park Farm  
East Malling Train Estate  
Bradbourne Lane  
Aylesford  
Kent  
ME20 6NN  
01732 448120

Job Title		Merton Park, Canterbury	
Drawing Title		Bus Provision	
Client		Quinn Estates	
Scale	Date	Designed	
1:5000 @ A1	May 2025	DH	
Drawn	Checked	Approved	
DH	CG	CG	
Job No	Drawing No	Rev	
22-022	22-022/048	A	

## Indicative Timetable for Ashford - Canterbury via Sites C6 and C7

		Intermediate time	Veh 1	Veh 2	Veh 3	Veh 4	Veh 1
Ashford Park Street	Existing		07:00	07:30	08:00	08:30	09:00
Kennington Post Office	Existing	00:08	07:08	07:38	08:08	08:38	09:08
Chilham Felborough Cl	Existing	00:16	07:24	07:54	08:24	08:54	09:24
Chartham Hatch Howfield Lane	Existing	00:11	07:35	08:05	08:35	09:05	09:35
Milton Manor Rbt	Proposed	00:01	07:36	08:06	08:36	09:06	09:36
Cockering Farm	Proposed	00:02	07:38	08:08	08:38	09:08	09:38
Saxon Fields	Proposed	00:04	07:42	08:12	08:42	09:12	09:42
Site C7	Proposed	00:06	07:48	08:18	08:48	09:18	09:48
Site C6	Proposed	00:02	07:50	08:20	08:50	09:20	09:50
Canterbury Bus Station	Existing	00:04	07:54	08:24	08:54	09:24	09:54
<b>Turnaround time - 6 minutes</b>							
Canterbury Bus Station	Existing		08:00	08:30	09:00	09:30	10:00
Site C6	Proposed	00:04	08:04	08:34	09:04	09:34	10:04
Site C7	Proposed	00:02	08:06	08:36	09:06	09:36	10:06
Saxon Fields	Proposed	00:06	08:12	08:42	09:12	09:42	10:12
Cockering Farm	Proposed	00:04	08:16	08:46	09:16	09:46	10:16
Milton Manor Rbt	Proposed	00:02	08:18	08:48	09:18	09:48	10:18
Chartham Hatch Howfield Lane	Existing	00:01	08:19	08:49	09:19	09:49	10:19
Chilham Felborough Cl	Existing	00:11	08:30	09:00	09:30	10:00	10:30
Kennington Post Office	Existing	00:16	08:46	09:16	09:46	10:16	10:46
Ashford Park Street	Existing	00:08	08:54	09:24	09:54	10:24	10:54
<b>Turnaround time - 6 minutes</b>							

*Four vehicles provides 30 minutes frequency*



## Appendix H Parking Surveys

# K&M TRAFFIC SURVEYS

DATE : WEDNESDAY 30TH APRIL & THURSDAY 1ST MAY 2025

LOCATION ; HOMERSHAM, CANTERBURY, CT1 3RG

ROAD NAME	ZONE	RESTRICTION	METRES	5M - 1 SPACE	WEDNESDAY 30TH APRIL 2025			THURSDAY 1ST MAY 2025		
					00:45 HOURS			00:45 HOURS		
					PARKED VEHICLES	OBSERVED SPACES	PARKING STRESS	PARKED VEHICLES	OBSERVED SPACES	PARKING STRESS
HOMERSHAM	1	TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	51							
		DROP KERB	9.6							
		DOUBLE YELLOW	47.5							
HOLLOW LANE	2	DOUBLE YELLOW	69.7							
	3	DOUBLE YELLOW	128.4							
		SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR MON-FRI 8am-5pm	38.2							
		LAY-BY UNRESTRICTED	10	2	2	0	100.00%	2	0	100.00%
	4	DOUBLE YELLOW	50							
	5	SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR MON-FRI 8am-5pm	30.5							
DROP KERB		10.6								
DOUBLE YELLOW		140.7								
BRAYEBROOK ROAD (Private)	6	TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	56							
		UNRESTRICTED	11	2	2	0	100.00%	2	0	100.00%
		DROP KERB	48							
LOCKYER MEWS (Private)	7	WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	29							
	8	TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	16.7							
		DROP KERB	12.2							
BRAYEBROOK ROAD (Private)	9	LAY-BY UNRESTRICTED	19.5	3	0	3	0.00%	0	3	0.00%
		DROP KERB	5.8							
		UNRESTRICTED	11.8	2	0	2	0.00%	0	2	0.00%
	10	TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	11							
GREENWICH PLACE (Private)	11	WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	13.5							
	12	WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	13.5							
BRAYEBROOK ROAD (Private)	13	UNRESTRICTED	16.8	3	0	3	0.00%	0	3	0.00%
		DROP KERB	17							
ALEXANDER MEWS (Private)	14	WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	24.5							
		NOSE IN BAYS	23.5	8	6	2	75.00%	6	2	75.00%
		DROP KERB	6.4							
	15	NOSE IN BAYS	22	8	3	5	37.50%	2	6	25.00%
		DROP KERB	6.6							
		WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	28.2							
BRAYEBROOK ROAD (Private)	16	UNRESTRICTED	4.3							
		VISITOR BAY	15	3	0	3	0.00%	0	3	0.00%

Summary of Results		
	Wed 30th	Thurs 1st
Parking Courts	67%	67%
Street Areas	50%	46%

ROSELANDS PLACE (Private)	17	WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	53.9							
		DROP KERB	5.2							
		GARAGES	22.2							
	18	WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	73.2							
		GARAGES	13.5							
19	WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	47.4								
	VISITOR BAY	11.5	2	0	2	0.00%	0	2	0.00%	
BRAYEBROOK ROAD (Private)	20	UNRESTRICTED	15.8	2	0	2	0.00%	0	2	0.00%
		DROP KERB	9.3							
	21	UNRESTRICTED	8	1	0	1	0.00%	0	1	0.00%
		DROP KERB	12.7							
		TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	15							
HOLLOW LANE	22	TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	57.5							
		DROP KERB	3.5							
	23	TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	27							
		DROP KERB	10							
		DOUBLE YELLOW	21.3							
HOMERSHAM	24	DOUBLE YELLOW	52.8							
		DROP KERB	3.5							
	25	DOUBLE YELLOW	6.7							
		UNRESTRICTED	75	14	6	7	46.15%	7	6	53.85%
SCOTT AVENUE	26	DROP KERB	16							
		WOULD NOT PARK UNRESTRICTED	13.5							
		DROP KERB	15.7							
		UNRESTRICTED	71.5	12	8	4	66.67%	7	5	58.33%
		NOSE IN BAYS	12	4	2	2	50.00%	2	2	50.00%
BIRCH ROAD	27	TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	62.4							
		UNRESTRICTED	18.7	2	2	0	100.00%	2	0	100.00%
		DROP KERB	15.6							
	28	DROP KERB	9.3							
		UNRESTRICTED	29.9	5	3	1	75.00%	1	4	20.00%
	29	DROP KERB	14.7							
		UNRESTRICTED	6.6	1	1	0	100.00%	1	0	100.00%
	30	TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	17.5							
		UNRESTRICTED	25.7	5	4	0	100.00%	2	2	50.00%
		DOUBLE YELLOW	11.5							
	31	DOUBLE YELLOW	11.5							
		TOO NARROW UNRESTRICTED	34.8							
UNRESTRICTED		118.2	17	8	7	53.33%	7	8	46.67%	
		DROP KERB	37.3							



PRIVATE PARKING COURTS	A	HOWLAND MEWS		2	0	2	0.00%	0	2	0.00%
	B	BRAYEBROOK ROAD - PRIVATE		9	8	1	88.89%	8	1	88.89%
	C	GREENWICH PLACE PRIVATE		10	8	2	80.00%	8	2	80.00%
	D	SHARNBROOK PLACE PRIVATE		11	8	3	72.73%	8	3	72.73%
	E	OFF HOMERSHAM		7	7	0	100.00%	7	0	100.00%
	F	OFF HOMERSHAM		6	6	0	100.00%	5	1	83.33%
	G	OFF SCOTT AVENUE		7	5	2	71.43%	6	1	85.71%
	H	OFF SCOTT AVENUE		9	7	2	77.78%	7	2	77.78%
	I	OFF SCOTT AVENUE		8	4	4	50.00%	3	5	37.50%
	J	OFF BIRCH ROAD		11	9	3	75.00%	9	3	75.00%
	K	OFF SCOTT AVENUE	APPROX BAYS	10	6	4	60.00%	6	4	60.00%
	L	OFF SCOTT AVENUE	OR CARS IN	6	2	4	33.33%	3	3	50.00%
	M	OFF SCOTT AVENUE	FRONT OF	10	8	2	80.00%	8	2	80.00%
	N	OFF SCOTT AVENUE	GARAGES	10	5	5	50.00%	5	5	50.00%
	O	OFF SCOTT AVENUE		6	2	4	33.33%	2	4	33.33%
	P	SULLIVAN COURT - PRIVATE		30	20	10	66.67%	20	10	66.67%
	Q	OFF HOMERSHAM - PRIVATE		32	16	8	66.67%	16	8	66.67%
	R	OFF HOMERSHAM - PRIVATE		16	10	6	62.50%	10	6	62.50%
	S1	OFF GILBERT WAY		5	5	0	100.00%	5	0	100.00%
	S	OFF GILBERT WAY		4	3	1	75.00%	3	1	75.00%
T	OFF GILBERT WAY		12	7	3	70.00%	8	2	80.00%	
U	OFF GILBERT WAY		12	6	6	50.00%	6	6	50.00%	
V	OFF GILBERT WAY		3	2	1	66.67%	2	1	66.67%	
W	OFF GILBERT WAY		8	3	5	37.50%	3	5	37.50%	
				244	157	78	66.81%	158	77	67.23%