

# Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) 2019 – 2029



# Vision for Ashford

We envisage delivering a network of routes, through provision of quality infrastructure, to enable a greater uptake of cycling and walking across the borough.

**Our proposed approach to deliver this transformative change is to:**

- Provide a network of primary, neighbourhood and strategic greenway cycle and walking corridors to act as core routes for the highest volumes of journeys
- Improve journeys into the Town Centre for pedestrians and cyclists
- Create networks of quieter streets where children play out, neighbours catch up, air pollution is lower, and cycling and walking are the natural choice for everyday journeys
- Increase the proportion of active travel journeys in the borough, easing congestion, supporting the council's carbon neutrality agenda and to improve health.

The LCWIP process undertaken in Ashford follows principles and this document is structured into chapters which reflect this process as follows:

- **Chapter 1** provides a background to the LCWIP and the scope of the area. It will provide details of engagement plans with the community and how the LCWIP will be structured.
- **Chapter 2** covers the 'Evidence Base' upon which the cycle and walking network is to be developed. It provides details of the relevant policies that already exist, active travel patterns in the area and the residents' current patterns of travel. It provides details on the current road safety information and the resident's views of cycling and walking in the area at present.
- **Chapter 3** looks at the network planning for cycling and the route selection providing a background to each route and detail of the proposed schemes with potential costings.
- **Chapter 4** looks at the network planning for walking and the route selection providing a background to each route and detail of the proposed schemes with potential costings.
- **Chapter 5** details the prioritisation of schemes for cycling with explanations and the rationale for the categories.
- **Chapter 6** explains the integration and application of the LCWIP to policy and its links to wider strategies along with funding and monitoring of the schemes.

## Definitions



The term 'cyclist' throughout this document refers to any one person who chooses to use a cycle as a mode of transport (including as a mobility aid). This includes children, elderly and inexperienced cyclists, as much as 'commuter' cyclists who tend to be adults who cycle on a regular basis. It also includes those benefiting from electrically-assisted pedal cycles (e-bikes).

When referring to "pedestrians" or "walking" it is intended that this refers to wheelchair, mobility scooter users as well those with prams and pushchairs. When a place works well for people in wheelchairs it works for everyone.



## Contents

Vision for Ashford	1
Definitions	3
<b>Chapter 1 – Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 - What is the LCWIP?	6
1.2 - Scope of the LCWIP	7
1.3 – Statement of engagement	9
<b>Chapter 2 – Evidence Base</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 - Related policies	11
2.2 - Existing active travel network	14
2.3 - Existing Patterns of Travel	17
2.4 – Road Safety	19
2.5 – Residents views on cycling and walking	20
<b>Chapter 3 – Network Planning for Cycling</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 – Route Selection	24
3.2 - Route assessment	32
<b>Chapter 4: Network planning for walking</b>	<b>41</b>
4.1 Route Selection	42
4.2 – Route Assessment	45
<b>Chapter 5: Prioritisation of schemes</b>	<b>60</b>
5.0 - Ashford Walking and Cycling Prioritisation and rationale of schemes	61
5.1 – Route Rationale with stakeholders	76
<b>Chapter 6: Integration and application</b>	<b>82</b>
6.1 - Policy integration	83
6.2 - Funding and implementation	83
6.3 - Monitoring	84
<b>Chapter 7 – Bibliography</b>	<b>85</b>

# Chapter 1 – Introduction



## 1.1 - What is the LCWIP?

On 12th August 2013, the Prime Minister announced his intention to "kick start, a cycling revolution which would remove the barriers for a new generation of cyclists". The draft Cycling Delivery Plan published by the Department for Transport (DfT) on 16th October 2014 demonstrates the significant role cycling and walking can play as a sustainable transport mode and congestion reliever, the trigger for the creation of good quality public realm and liveable communities which bring significant economic returns, and - perhaps most significantly - a major driver to improving the nation's health through its physical activity benefits.

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs), have been introduced in the Government's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (2017). They enable a long-term approach to developing local cycling and walking networks, and form a vital part of the Government's strategy to increase the number of trips made on foot or by cycle (i.e. active modes of transport).

**Cycling and walking both generally have two main purposes; utility and leisure:**

- **Active travel involves making a journey for the main purpose of doing an activity at the journey's end, such as work, education or shopping.**
- **Leisure walking (including running) and cycling, whether undertaken independently, as part of social activities or within competitive sport, delivers substantial health, social and wider community benefits.**

The LCWIP focuses on providing fit for purpose walking and cycling infrastructure as a means of everyday transportation, from point A to B to access employment, education and retail, and leisure opportunities.

The process includes analysing local census data to establish the most heavily used cycling and walking routes where key improvements would secure the greatest benefits.

Ashford Borough Council was selected by the Department for Transport (DfT) as a pilot project to trial the preparation of LCWIPs and has received support from consultants, Mott Macdonald.

The Ashford LCWIP follows the Technical Guidance around integration of cycling and walking with transport planning and land use planning. It has been prepared in consultation with Kent County Council as the Local Highway Authority. KCC will be responsible for implementing the actions within the LCWIP.

Cycling and walking as modes of transport have many similarities, however the LCWIP process outlines separate approaches to planning and identifying walking and cycling improvements.

**The key outputs of the LCWIP are:**

- ***A network plan for cycling and walking which identifies preferred routes and core zones for focusing the improvements***
- ***A prioritised programme of infrastructure improvements for future investment***
- ***A report which sets out the underlying analysis carried out and provides a narrative which supports the identified improvements and network (This document).***

The LCWIP guidance sets out six stages to achieving cycling and walking improvements through the LCWIP process:

1. **Determine Scope** – define where, geographically, an LCWIP is appropriate and arrangements for governing and preparing the LCWIP plan.
2. **Gathering Evidence / Information** – Identify existing patterns of walking and cycling to understand where people walk and cycle now. Review existing conditions and identify barriers to cycling and walking and where infrastructure investment could strengthen and expand active travel activity.
3. **Network Plan for cycling** – Identify origin and destination points and cycle flows. Convert flows into a network of routes and determine the type of improvements required.
4. **Network Plan for walking** – in many places people and bikes won't mix that well, so define key walking zones and required improvements separately.
5. **Prioritise Improvements** – Prioritise which improvements deliver maximum value for money and develop a phased programme for future investment.
6. **Integration and application** – Integrate outputs and embed LCWIP plans into other local planning policies, strategies and delivery plans.

## **1.2 - Scope of the Ashford LCWIP**

The Town Centre is the main focus of the LCWIP due to the high level of trip generators in and around the town. The evidence based on a 5km cycle and 2km walking distance from Ashford Town Centre as shown in the map on page 10.

Also due to the large geographic physical size of Ashford borough (225 square miles), it was considered important to identify specific areas for targeted improvement, rather than implement isolated schemes on a borough-wide basis.

Residential development and more people living in Ashford's Town Centre is fundamental to the borough council's Local Plan. It will drive vitality, activity and increase footfall to enable regeneration, as well as providing new homes for local people.

The key streets in the Town Centre have already been successfully pedestrianised and enhanced to a good quality.

A number of factors affect the tendency to walk and cycle but if made difficult, people are less likely to do it – particularly if they don't have to. Councils need to make it easy and safe for people to follow the route that they want.



**Map 1: LCWIP Area**

### ***Safe and secure network***

Well designed, reactive pedestrian crossings can benefit all road users. Everybody should be able to cross the road safely, directly and with little delay. Crossings should be positioned in the right place and give everyone enough time to cross the road. Signalised crossings should prioritise people on foot with short wait times and comfortable crossing times.

Footways are provided for pedestrians only. Encroachment by vehicles parking or loading reduces the comfort and ease of use of footways, forcing pedestrians into the carriageway to pass the vehicles (especially people using wheelchairs and pushchairs). Equally where vehicles are parked over a cycleway, the need to avoid results in cyclists going into the road.

Concerns relating to personal security can discourage people from walking and cycling, particularly after dark. There are a wide range of factors which impact on this issue which the key stakeholder has some influence on include:

- **The existence and quality of street lighting**
- **Vegetation and tree cover which can make some paths feel unpleasant and increase the perceptions that they are unsafe places to walk**
- **Considerations of ways to increase footfall along remote underpasses by improving maintenance, sign posting and lighting.**

### ***Quality Network***

The desire to cycle and walk is influenced not only by distance, but also by the quality of the experience. A 20-minute walk alongside a busy road can seem endless, yet in an interesting town centre environment, the journey can pass without noticing.

The removal of street clutter, including redundant signing, benefits the pedestrian by reducing confusion and creating a more attractive walking environment. This is the key concept to Ashford Borough Council's shared space in the town centre design.

### ***Accessible network***

Ashford's population is getting older and more people have long term illnesses and conditions. Many streets require improvement to the latest accessibility standards so that Ashford's residents and visitors are more mobile.

At many locations across the borough, full height kerbs present a significant barrier to mobility. At locations where pedestrians are expected to cross, dropped kerbs should be provided to enable access to all users.

Existing networks should be upgraded where practical during maintenance or improvement schemes. Section 106 developer contributions and other external funding may also be available in specific locations to support this activity. A key point to achieve is that a resident or visitor can visit any shop in the town centre and leave your cycle in a safe and secure place within 25 metres.

## **1.3 – Statement of engagement**

As schemes included within the LCWIP are developed, it is important that communities are engaged to ensure they have a chance to input concerns and ideas. It will be vital to ensure those that are engaged include under-represented under the Equalities Act 2010 are consulted.

This will in turn support behavioural change and other non-infrastructure plans. It will also be important to promote community-led design as part of cycling and walking projects. This can be achieved with events such as face to face workshops and the use of social media and online questionnaires (using platforms such as Survey Monkey, Microsoft Survey Maker and MS Forms).

In the recent past there has been various commissions of a number of local intervention schemes including Bike to Work, pedal free bikes, bike maintenance and recycling old bikes. This has provided residents and businesses in the area an insight into how cycling can benefit their everyday lives. There has also been a number of healthy walks schemes across the borough, which has increased interest and the number of volunteers taking part over the last decade.

Further engagement on specific issues and proposals are being reviewed for future delivery. The LCWIP will be a live document subject to periodic review and consultation.

## Chapter 2 – Evidence Base



## 2.1 - Related Policies and Strategies

Active and sustainable modes of transport, such as cycling and walking, support good health and wellbeing by reducing inactivity, improving air quality and road safety. They also provide the most efficient use of street space and help to create a more attractive local environment for residents, visitors and businesses.

Ashford Borough Council is not the decision making body on highways and planning policies, these are made by Kent County Council (KCC) as the highway authority. To deliver the LCWIP programs Ashford Borough Council will need an endorsement and support from KCC.

On the 18<sup>th</sup> of July 2019, Ashford Borough Council pledged to become carbon neutral as a council and as a borough before 2030. This commitment is setting in motion several changes within the council, and the borough, a lot of them directly or indirectly supporting active travel. Indeed, to become carbon neutral, the borough will need to reduce carbon emissions stemming from its transport operations.

The Ashford Cycling and Walking Strategy 2019 – 2029 will be adopted.

The adopted Local Plan 2030 is also ensuring that cycling and walking are fully incorporated into development schemes across the borough. With proposals to build around 13,000 homes in the Chilmington Green, Kennington and Town Centre areas and creation of 11,000 job opportunities, Ashford is presented with a significant opportunity to promote active travel. Improving and increasing the network of cycling and walking routes as well as enhancing facilities for cyclists can be achieved through the planning process.

In the UK, several authorities, including Transport for London, have also adopted a Healthy Streets Approach. Healthy streets are streets with clean air, where everyone feels welcome, that are easy to cross, that provide shade and shelter that have places to stop and rest, are not too noisy, where people choose to walk and cycle, where people feel safe, where there are things to see and do, and where people feel relaxed. The borough will aim to design and create more healthy streets within the borough to increase its residents' well-being, promote active travel, and reduce air pollution.

The network plans and improvement lists created as part of this LCWIP will be considered to be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) (as standalone or part of other emerging SPD projects chosen will benefit both pedestrians and cyclists). Changes will be about giving pedestrians and cyclists priority and improving the safety of all road users. Projects will also balance larger infrastructural projects that may be less popular, with smaller softer non-infrastructural interventions.

Policies include the following:

- **Policy TRA5** – Planning for pedestrians, requires that all development proposals demonstrate how a safe and accessible pedestrian access and movement routes will be delivered in the context of wider movement networks around the sites.
- **Policy TRA6** seeks to improve conditions for cyclists through promoting and developing the cycle network by requiring developments, where opportunities arise, to connect to the networks and to provide cycle parking facilities on-site or financial contributions to those at the town centre, stations and major public buildings.

- **Policy TRA8** requires that all relevant planning applications should be accompanied by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment and Travel Plans which outline the developer's proposals for walking and cycling infrastructure that will be built as part of the scheme. (KCC Highways and Transportation are consulted routinely on planning applications).
- **The LTP 4 – Delivering Growth Without Gridlock 2016 – 2031** ([www.kent.gov.uk/localtransportplan](http://www.kent.gov.uk/localtransportplan)) has 5 Outcomes (1 – Economic growth and minimised congestion, 2- Affordable and accessible door to door journeys 3 – Safer travel, 4 – Enhanced environment, 5- Better health and wellbeing). These outcomes will help deliver the ambition for Kent: **To deliver safe and effective transport, ensuring that all Kent's communities and businesses benefit, the environment is enhanced and economic growth is supported.**

Transport is an essential part of the lives of the community as it connects with jobs, education, healthcare, shopping and a wide range of leisure activities. It is a key component of the economy as it links businesses with their workers, customers and clients, whilst providing for the delivery of goods.

Transport shapes our neighbourhoods and influences our lifestyles. Our choice of transport impacts on us as individuals and on our wider environment.

It is a well-documented fact that cars make poor use of available street space and offer a less efficient means of travel compared to cycling and walking. Motorised transport is also a major cause of harm to the environment including air pollution, noise and its impact on the living environment.

Wheels for Well Being 2017 survey of disabled cyclists showed that 69% of respondent's found cycling easier than walking. The majority, 52% used an ordinary cycle as a mobility aid and 18% used an electric bike.


In 2016, 62% agreed that “It is too dangerous for me to cycle on the roads” (The British Social Attitudes Survey). This rises to 68% for non-cyclists, the people we’re aiming for.



The 2017 ‘BikeLife’ survey commissioned by Sustrans found that:

**64%** of residents would cycle more if more roadside cycle routes were created, physically separated from traffic

**78%** of people support building more protected roadside cycle lanes, even when this could mean less space for other road traffic, including 74% of residents who do not ride a bike



## 2.2 - Existing active travel network

Ashford as a borough is a significant land area and consists of 225 square miles, particularly of rural areas. It is traversed by a number of major trunk routes, railway lines and water courses, which provides a number of challenges and barriers to extending the cycling and walking networks.

Ashford's current cycling network consists of a combination of on and off road routes. In the last survey in 2014 it was reported that there are over 13 miles of surfaced segregated cycle paths and just under 8 miles of unsurfaced paths.

The current network is in most places good and form the foundations for a high quality network for active travel, but there are gaps in network coverage and variations in quality across the current network.

In the past 8-10 years Kent County Council (KCC) and partner agencies have implemented the following into the Ashford borough:

- 1) **Footway / cycleway bridge over the M20 to link Sainsburys on Simone Weil Avenue with The Eureka Leisure Park**
- 2) **Willesborough Dykes footway / cycleway providing a link between Park Farm and Ashford Town Centre**
- 3) **Footway / cycleway into Finberry from the A2070 together with an improved crossing across the A2070**
- 4) **Footway / cycleway between Park Farm East and Finberry to provide a direct route to Finberry Primary School**

**Shared use paths** – There are many existing shared use paths which form an extensive neighbourhood route network across parts of the Ashford area. Some of these are on purpose built footway/ cycleways such as the Willesborough Dykes footway and within Victoria Park.

Many new-town roads which have been constructed from local development sites have been fitted with a shared use path adjacent to the road. For example, the new paths constructed on the new Repton Park development.

In spring 2008, the shared space area was introduced in Elwick Place in Ashford town centre (see photo on page 16). The scheme replaced a section of Ashford's former four-lane ring road with two-way streets on which drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians have equal priority. Unnecessary street furniture, road markings and traffic lights have been removed and the speed limit cut to 20 mph. The scheme has been claimed to have improved safety records. Between November 2008 and January 2011, there has been four road casualties. Even though the shared space has increased the accessibility to cycling and walking in the town centre area, it is still a very car dominated urban environment.

In places, the combination of shared use paths and greenways provide a good network of traffic free or very lightly trafficked routes.



### ***Transport challenges***

Without a transformational change to the way that people travel there is a risk Ashford could become a less desirable place for people to live, work, play and invest in. An aspiration for Ashford is to create an active travel destination that is not dominated by car movements and where streets provide a space for people to gather that is pleasant to be in.

A comprehensive, high quality and well used cycling and walking network will support and enable the developmental aspirations of the Borough. This network needs to be dense and continuous and 'through' traffic needs to be reduced to lessen congestion, encourage active travel, improve air quality and improve perceptions of safety.

It is also important to identify future changes to transport and land use that may be completed within the timescale of the LCWIP. Transport and land use changes will be necessary since additional traffic calming measures may not actually deliver modal shift. Indeed, an example of this can be seen from examples such as Waltham Forest's Mini-Holland programme, where infrastructural changes and traffic management needs to be implemented in order to make streets truly friendly for pedestrians and cyclists. Thus, to achieve significant modal shift, partner organisations will need to implement well-thought out large infrastructure redesign projects linked with behaviour change programmes and the LCWIP is the first step towards identifying these types of projects.

Ashford has an extensive network of cycling and walking routes through the town centre and some semi-rural areas. Ashford's cycling and walking networks have developed over time as funding has become available and as infrastructure development has come forward and so can be disjointed.



Image of shared use path at Repton Park

**On-road** – There are a number of roads in the Ashford borough that follow historic highway patterns and there is insufficient room to retrofit improved pedestrian cycling and walking infrastructure. Many of these areas are also built up with houses close to the footways so shared paths are also not an option. The main areas that present with this issue are Newtown, Hythe Road and Willesborough.

**Low Traffic Neighbourhoods** – Recently KCC and partner agencies have closed Highfield Lane in Ashford to vehicular traffic as part of the employment proposals at Junction 10a to provide a better pedestrian / cycle environment between Mersham and Ashford Retail Park.

**Public Cycle Parking** – Within Ashford Town Centre there is cycle parking in all major hubs and there is also a new cycle parking hub at the Ashford International Train station. All the train stations in the area provide some cycle parking but conditions of these and amount, do vary.

## 2.3 - Existing Patterns of Travel

### *Identifying barriers to movement*

Barriers to movement were identified to understand how they may impact on potential cycle movements. The existing Ashford cycling network is strongly influenced by several constraints and barriers both natural and man-made. These include:

- **A busy road network that is difficult to cross (for example the M20 motorway).**
- **Main roads with little or no movement to gain cycle lanes**
- **Current cycle routes that do not link up**
- **Poorly maintained routes**
- **Inadequate storage and changing facilities**

Ashford has very high car ownership levels of 81% and this is also well above the 74% national average.

### **2.3.1 – Active Travel**

Data sourced from Active Lives data provided by Sport England and shows Ashford's current cycling and walking rate is slightly lower than the county average. In a report by the Department for Transport, Walking and Cycling Statistics: England 2018; it reported that Ashford has currently between 68 – 71% of adults walking at least once a week. This is classified as mid ground. 12 – 17% of adults reported to cycle at least once a week again seen as mid ground.


### ***Travel to work***

Purely in terms of travel to work, most short journeys are still made by car. The South East is slightly higher at 71% than the national average of 67%.

These car trips contribute to congestion on the roads, poor air quality and contribute to poor health caused by inactivity.

### ***Travel to school / college –***

Travel associated with education generates a substantial number of trips. Children can get their daily dose of physical activity without even thinking about it, just by cycling/scooting and walking all or part of their journey.



Above is a chart displaying the modal share for Primary schools in the Ashford area against Kent wide data. Ashford has a high percentage of students that travel to school in a car and a smaller percentage of students that travel to school by foot or other modes of transport

Ashford has 43 primary schools and 7 secondary schools and these are split between the urban town (within 10 minutes' walk of the Ashford town centre), the outskirts of Ashford and the rural areas of Ashford. Ashford is made up of a town centre and suburb areas that present their own travel issues. The Table 3 shows the split of the schools in the area.

**Table 3:** Schools in Ashford

Type of School	Town Centre (within 10 minute's walk from the town centre)	Outskirts/suburbs which are located 10 minute drive from town centre	Rural
<b>Primary</b>	7	16	22
<b>Secondary included 6<sup>th</sup> forms</b>	3	2	2
<b>SEN (special educational Needs)</b>	0	1	1
<b>Independent</b>	1	0	3
<b>College</b>	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>28</b>

### 2.3.2 - Public Transport

Cycling and walking in Ashford should also be an attractive option for the first and last mile of a person's longer journey. Within Ashford town centre there are various other means of transport, including trains, buses and bicycle hire (available at the International Station e.g. Brompton cycles cost £3.50 for 24 hours as of October 2019).

*Rail* – It is estimated that over 3.9 Million people use Ashford International Train Station each year. The station connects to London via the High Speed 1 line and also to the continent via the Eurostar. Services within the borough include; Pluckley, Hamsteet, Appledore, Charing, Chilham and Wye.

There is a contained bike storage area located at Ashford International Station that can house up to 454 Cycles. There are bike storage areas at the station and at other rail stations within the borough.

*Bus* - Stagecoach is the main bus provider within the Ashford borough and in the year 2016 – 2017 they recorded 3,503,817 passengers. Many services are centred on the town centre interchange providing a circular route. This provides good access to the town centre, but travel across the Borough is less convenient.

### 2.4 – Road Safety

The safety of people cycling, in terms of actual number of collisions and subjective (how safe a journey feels) clearly has an impact on the attractiveness of cycling and walking in Ashford. Concern about safety on the roads is a key barrier to people getting on their bikes and travelling on foot.





Chart shows KCC Personal injury collision and casualty data for the Ashford Borough for the 5 year period to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017

Ashford has seen significant improvements in road safety for cyclists over the last 10 years with a spike in casualties to 2014 and then a gradual downward trend since then. It was reported that there was one pedal cycle cluster site (based on 3 or more collisions within 50 miles over the last three years).

This was at the junction of A2042 Station Road J/W Tannery Lane (601207 / 142553); This cluster site is investigated annually by KCC to identify engineering measures that can apply remedial action to the site.

Nationally, only 6% of deaths and 14% of serious injuries are amongst cyclists, although over four times as many pedestrians (25%) are killed in road collisions.



**Chart shows KCC personal injury collision and casualty data for the Ashford Borough for the 5 year period to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

The picture is slightly different for pedestrians, with no cluster site there has been a decrease in pedestrian casualties since 2015. The main ward identified in the casualty data is Victoria Ward which encompasses the town centre and identified core walking zone which is explained further in chapter 4.

## 2.5 – Local residents views on cycling and walking

The initiative to promote Active Modes of travel has been outlined in the recently produced Draft Ashford Cycling and Walking Strategy 2019-2029<sup>i</sup>. The objectives of the Cycling and Walking strategy are as follows:

- ***To provide and improve the cycling and walking network***
- ***To increase cycle parking around the borough***
- ***Maintaining the existing cycling and walking network***
- ***Focusing on safer cycling***
- ***Promoting cycling and walking in the borough***
- ***Increasing opportunities for cycling and walking tourism***

The Cycling and Walking Strategy 2019 – 2029 went through a first round of consultation in the summer of 2019. Feedback from 532 residents from this consultation confirmed that most people ride their bike for leisure. The main reasons as to why people do not currently cycle or do not cycle regularly include; safety concerns about sharing the road with cars, particularly in locations where no alternative cycle paths are available, medical concerns, not owning a bike, lack of existing pathways, or a lack of a connected cycle network, especially in more rural locations.

Additionally, the consultation feedback stated that people would be encouraged to walk more often, if safety and visibility was increased with better lighting, therefore potentially reducing crime. Other points stated were; if infrastructure and facilities were improved, and the quality of walking routes were enhanced this could increase people walking. This includes suggestions such as quality pathways, more seating along the routes, and more, sensibly placed crossings. Walkers stated they wish to have attractive and interesting destinations to visit with a variety of routes and paths.

Finally, the consultation clearly identified that residents' desire more paths and routes to cycle and walk. Key to this is a connected network of paths, so that residents can get to where they need to safely and efficiently. New and existing paths are to be well maintained – e.g. free of potholes, debris and overgrown foliage. These paths should be well signed so they can be located easily, and maps should be available. The council should promote the pathways to encourage people to use them.

#### **Key aspirations of the consultation were:**

**Safety for all:** To make cycling and walking an enjoyable, safe and easy way of moving around, Ashford will improve road conditions for pedestrians and cyclists by making routes safer by providing designated car and cycle areas so that the roads can be used more easily by everyone.

**Vibrant Town Centre:** To ensure the scheme benefits the whole community by reducing traffic congestion in some areas, the scheme will ease parking pressures, reduce pollution and noise levels, and create a greener environment for residents to enjoy. The community will also benefit by being involved in the development of relevant schemes, which in turn could support the local economy, enabling Ashford to become a vibrant and attractive location for businesses, residents and visitors.

**Connected borough:** To ensure the borough's Town Centre is better connected via cycling routes and improve the way in which all are connected to neighbouring settlements and boroughs. The cycling and walking networks are to be continuous throughout our borough, allowing residents to enjoy Ashford's unique natural assets and better connecting our vibrant rural communities.

**Improved well-being:** To use the scheme (LCWIP) to increase the levels of cycling and walking amongst residents. Getting more residents to use a bike or walk will improve mental and physical health and fitness levels in the borough. With that in mind, it is important to recognise that people need to feel confident cycling and walking so in addition to making routes safer, it is important to offer a range of activities to increase their confidence levels.

**Cycle to work schemes** – Kent County Council operate a sustainable travel grant scheme for schools and businesses which informs and promote sustainable travel choices, working with students, employers and employees to understand the barriers to making more sustainable journeys and where possible instigate change. In addition, jobseekers also receive advice on their travel options to different job destinations which can increase their employment opportunities.

The main promotional tool in Ashford to support cycling is a Cycle Route Map. This has been developed by Visit Kent with the help of many partners, and is regularly reviewed and updated when new routes are built. This is accessible in paper form for many outlets in the town centre and also online through the Visit Kent Website ([www.visitkent.co.uk](http://www.visitkent.co.uk)). There is also the Kent Connected webpage which gives personalised travel planning options ([www.kentconnected.org](http://www.kentconnected.org))

Data from the 2011 Census shows that only 2% of Ashford's residents cycle to work. Ashford Borough Council target is 5% of residents cycling to work by 2029. If this target is to be met and ease the burden of traffic to make it easier for people to use other means of transport. This means having two and a half times more people regularly using their bike to get to work. This will not happen overnight and will not occur without significant and sustained interventions. However, whilst the growth target is ambitious, it is attainable.



## Chapter 3 – Network Planning for Cycling



### 3.1 – Cycle Route Selection

Converting desire lines into routes for inclusion in LCWIPs is an iterative process, and is one of the most important elements of the LCWIP.

In most cases, there will be a clear preferred cycle route, which is usually the most direct. However, in some cases there may be more than one potential route between origin and destination points or a reason why the most direct route is not suitable for cycling. There will always be conflicting demands when it comes to selecting routes. As such, it is important that the needs of all users are considered when selecting routes, and that the wider transport priorities for specific roads, junctions and spaces are understood in unison.

This section presents what the latest datasets, forecasts and models show about potential corridors and locations where current and future cycling demand could justify future investment.

#### **Making Ashford Cycle friendly**

Based on an evidence led approach as outlined within this report, the development of a network plan will identify core cycling corridors particularly in the town centre.

This network needs to be appealing, easy to use and safe to increase cycle numbers. Cycle routes only work if they connect places people want to go. The network infrastructure identified in this section will help people make journeys to work, school, shops and for other utility trips as well as for leisure.

There are different types of cyclists and each has their own preferences with regards to cycling facilities.

- **Experienced cyclists generally prefer more direct on-carriageway routes with minimum delays along the route.**
- **New or inexperienced cyclists may only feel confident cycling away from traffic or on quieter roads and place more emphasis on safety rather than directness.**


In view of this, providing for the needs of different cyclists within the available resources can sometimes be difficult.

The following sections outline the stages that have been applied to identify a cycle route network. This firstly involved identifying desire lines for travel to work trips using the Propensity to Cycle Tool and then applying these desire lines to the road network. Secondly, non-workplace trip attractors such as retail and schools were identified and, thirdly, potential demand associated with new and future development sites.

### 3.1.1 Propensity cycle tool and travel to work desire lines

The first step in testing the opportunity is to examine current travel patterns, including the origin, destination and length of short car trips, to gain a better understanding of the potential for cycling across the Borough.


A good starting point to increase cycling in Ashford borough would be to enable cyclists to cycle much more and for a wider range of journeys. The image below, obtained from the Propensity to Cycle Tool, show the percentage of commuters that cycle to work as per the Census 2011.




The Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT) for England and Wales, provides an evidence base to inform cycling investment. It was designed to assist transport planners and policy makers to prioritise investments and interventions to promote cycling. The PCT answers the question: 'where is cycling currently common and where has cycling the greatest potential to grow?'

# Map 2

Government target scenario using the Propensity to Cycle Tool to identify the 30 commuter routes with the most potential

-  PCT Routes 0 - 10
-  PCT Routes 11 - 20
-  PCT Routes 21 - 30



### 3.1.2 – Non workplace trip attractors

All trips have an origin and a destination. The DfT guidance states that identifying demand for a planned network should start by mapping the main origin and destination points across the geographical area to be covered by the LCWIP.

A variety of major trip attractors within Ashford LCWIP area have been identified through site assessments, assessments of relevant data and consultation with key stakeholders. These strategic locations attract a significant number of trips, and as such they could have the potential to attract a sizeable number of future cycling trips.

The DfT guidance identifies that it may be appropriate to include only the most significant trip generators. Some types of destination were excluded (e.g. schools, individual retail stores) to create a manageable number of destinations.

It was decided to not include primary and secondary schools at the strategic level, but to focus on the larger educational trip generator at Ashford College site located in the Town Centre. Primary and secondary schools will be considered when looking at local connectivity to ensure that there are appropriate connections within local areas and to the strategic network

The following trip generators were plotted onto Map 3 (shown on page 29):

**Healthcare** – The approach was applied to healthcare establishments such as the William Harvey Hospital and key Health Centres in the area. The smaller providers (such as GP surgeries) sites will be introduced when looking at local connectivity. The William Harvey Hospital is not shown in Map 3 as it is located outside of the town.

**Transport** - The transport interchange was identified as the Ashford International railway station as this is the major rail station in the area. The other railway stations in the borough of Ashford including Appledore, Charing, Chilham, Hamstreet, Pluckley, and Wye. All these stations are served by Ashford International Station.

**Social/leisure** – The main leisure centre within the town is the Stour Centre and retail outlets being in Ashford town centre, the McArthur Glen Designer Outlet Centre and Eureka Park.

# Map 3

## Major Trip Attractors in the Area

- Castle Farm
- Town Centre
- Schools
- Other Attractors
- LCWIP boundary



### ***Clustering***

As part of the LCWIP process once the significant trip origin and destination points were identified and mapped, the next step was clustering. This involves grouping trip generators within proximity to each other into clusters allowing for the identification of significant trip generation. However, it is vital that the clustering exercise doesn't exclude some trip types, including:

Leisure/Recreation – Significant focus of the LCWIP is centred on catering for utility trips but leisure cycling will not be neglected as it has been shown that this can encourage future utility trips as well as providing huge health benefits.

Cross Boundary – Although the LCWIP focuses on shorter trips within the urban area, desire lines for longer trips, such as those to/from neighbouring wards are also present. Travel between wards and parishes in Ashford is important and will need to be considered as part of improvements to the overall cycling network.

### **3.1.3 - Developments**

**Map 4** (on page 31) highlights that within the Local Plan 2030 the urban developments including housing, commercial, leisure hubs and the green corridor. Within the Ashford Urban area it is expected that over the next 10 years (2018 – 2030) that 2649 housing units will be built. Connections to the development allocations have been considered in the development of the cycle network and the borough council intend to seek extensions to the network to serve these through the planning process.


### **3.1.4 Identifying routes**

The main purpose of the Route Selection Tool (RST) is to assess the suitability of a route against a set of core design outcomes. The RST enables a route to be assessed in both its existing state and potential future state, if improvements were made. These are the routes that were assessed within the area and the RST results will be displayed in the following chapter.

# Map 4

Housing site allocations  
from the Local Plan 2030


 Housing Site Allocation



# Map 5

Cycle routes identified using the Route Selection Tool (RST)

- |   |         |  |                |   |                          |
|---|---------|--|----------------|---|--------------------------|
|    | Route 1 |    | Route 6        |    | Town Centre              |
|  | Route 2 |  | Route 7        |  | Schools                  |
|  | Route 3 |  | Route 8        |  | Housing Allocation Sites |
|  | Route 4 |  | Route 9        |  | Other Attractors         |
|  | Route 5 |  | LCWIP boundary |   |                          |



## **3.2 – Cycling Route assessment**

An audit was undertaken of the existing infrastructure in areas identified as being key to providing a high quality network to serve existing and potential cycle journeys. Gaps in provision, suitable schemes and additional links were then identified.

Based on this audit a programme of works, including specific ‘cycling’ projects as well as improvements secured as part of new developments, regeneration projects and wider schemes, and will proactively identify funding opportunities.

### **3.2.1 - Introduction**

To help assess and compare potential routes for inclusion in the network, a Route Selection Tool (RST) was developed.

The primary function of the tool is to assess the suitability of a route in its existing condition against the core design outcomes and then compare it with the potential future state, if improvements were made. It also enables the merits of alternative routes to be easily compared.

#### ***Route Selection Tool Criteria***

The RST uses a range of criteria to assess how well a route meets the core design outcomes for cycling ranging from 5, being the highest, to 0, being the lowest. The criteria are:

- directness
- gradient
- safety
- connectivity
- comfort

<p><b>Coherent</b></p> 	<p>The network must be coherent; it must link all the places cyclists want to start and finish their journeys with a route quality that is consistent and easy to navigate. Abrupt changes in the level of provision for cyclists will mean that an otherwise serviceable route becomes disjointed and unusable by the majority of potential users.</p>
<p><b>Direct</b></p> 	<p>Routes for cyclists must provide direct and fast routes from origin to destination. In order to make cycling preferable to driving, routes for cyclists must be at least as direct – and preferably more direct – than that available for private motor vehicles. An indirect route for cyclists may result in some of them choosing the more direct, faster route, even if it is unsuitable for cycling.</p>
<p><b>Safe</b></p> 	<p>Cycle networks must not only improve cyclists' safety, but also their feeling of how safe the environment is. Consideration must be given to reducing the speeds of motor vehicles to acceptable levels, particularly when cyclists are expected to share the carriageway. The need for cyclists to come into close proximity and conflict with motor traffic must be removed, particularly at junctions, where the majority of crashes occur.</p>
<p><b>Comfortable</b></p> 	<p>Smooth surfaces, with minimal stopping and starting, without the need to ascend or descend steep gradients and which present few conflicts with other users creates comfortable conditions that are more conducive to cycling. The presence of high speed, high volume motor traffic affects both the safety and the comfort of the user.</p>
<p><b>Attractive</b></p> 	<p>Cyclists are more aware of the environment they are moving through than people in cars or other motor vehicles. Cycling is a pleasurable activity, in part because it involves such close contact with the surroundings. The attractiveness of the route itself will therefore affect whether users choose to cycle.</p>

A number of critical junctions are also recorded to enable a high level evaluation of both links and junctions within one tool.

A Critical Junction is defined as one that has characteristics that are hazardous for cyclists e.g. high volume, lack of priority or segregation, crossing high speed on-off slip roads or large roundabouts.

### 3.2.2 - RST Score Summaries

**Table 4 shows the outcomes of this on the routes identified.** The target is to score at least a 3 within each category. Some routes are not achieving this, but future feasibility work may alter this score and ranking.

Route No.	Route Name	Directness		Gradient		Safety		Connectivity		Comfort		Ranking (1 is priority)
		Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	
1	Hythe Road – Mace Lane	5	5	2.25	2.25	2.0	4.51	4.34	2.57	0	2.79	4
2	Canterbury Road	5	5	2.37	2.37	2.51	0	3.31	3.31	0.26	1.79	2
3a	Highworth School – A20 Road	5	5	4.22	4.22	3.78	0	4.49	0	1.00	4.17	7
3b	Highworth – Magazine Road	5	5	4.26	4.26	4.28	4.28	0.96	0.91	0	2.91	2 in conjunction with 3a
4	Repton Way	5	5	3.68	3.68	3.81	3.81	3.62	1.67	2.68	3.79	9
5	Victoria Park	5	5	3.83	3.83	4.64	4.64	1.20	1.20	2.62	3.28	9
6	Ashford Oaks	5	5	3.93	3.93	2.94	4.39	4.00	0.94	3.04	3.02	5
7	Kingsnorth Road – Jemmett Road	5	5	3.73	3.73	3.40	4.33	3.81	0.93	3.79	2.89	6
8	Beaver Road	5	5	4.18	4.39	3.32	3.85	2.70	2.00	3.18	2.22	1
9	Newtown	5	5	3.44	3.44	4.13	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.19	2.19	8

### 3.23 - Details of proposed cycling route schemes with costings

Route No.	Route Name	Sub Description	Project Description	Estimated cost	Total Cost (including approx. 44% fees (contingency, contractor etc.))
1	Hythe Road – Mace Lane	Bridge – petrol station	20Mph Limit Public Realm Improvements Crossing Points	£132,930.00	£15,500,000.00
		Petrol station – roundabout	20Mph Limit Public Realm Improvements Crossing Points	£143,010.00	
		Roundabout – town centre	Segregated cycle way Public realm improvements	£10,000,000.00	
2	Canterbury Road	Canterbury road crossing – Bridge	Light segregation Toucan Crossing	£79,000	£10,000,000.00
		Bridge - Town centre	Living Street Approach Improvement to bridge Improvements to public realm Traffic flow study Small improvements to pavement	£8,000,000.00	

			Linking bridge to Heathfield Road		
3a	Highworth School – A20 Road	Orchard Heights – Drovers	Widen footpath cycleways Move bus stop Toucan crossing Potentially continue footpath cycleway northbound	£162,828.00	
	Highworth – Magazine Road	Drovers – Barrowhill	Reduce capacity to provide segregated cycle lane North or South bound to be establish which is best. Toucan crossing	£221,320.00	£580,000.00
3b		Barrowhill - Town Centre	Reduce capacity roundabout north bound to provide space Raised table entry Barrowhill Increase width shared footpath Northbound Lidl car park Improve junction car parks Lidl and Barnardos	£146,880.00	£200,000.00

<b>4</b>	<b>Repton Way</b>	Tank RB - Western Avenue JCT	"Toucan Crossing 20 mph Living street Drop kerbs	£150,440.00	£310,000.00
		Western Avenue JCT – Bolt	"Raised table Speed cushion Signage 20mph"	£59,240.00	
		Bolt – Cinema	NA	NA	
		Cinema - Town Centre	NA	NA	
<b>5</b>	<b>Victoria Park</b>	Brookfield road - Hillbrow lane	NA	NA	£105,000.00
		"Hillbrow lane - Victoria park Fountain	NA	NA	
		"Victoria park Fountain - Cinema "	Toucan crossing	£55,000.00	
		Cinema - Town Centre	NA	NA	

6	Ashford Oaks	Arlington - Noakes Meadow	20mph	£17,250.00	£180,000.00
		Noakes Meadow Jemmett Road	NA	NA	
		Jemmett Road - Victoria park Fountain	"Improve shared footpath cycleway Signage + Painting Parking restriction to widen footpath"	£48,590.00	
		Victoria park Fountain – Cinema	NA	NA	
		Cinema - Town Centre	Toucan crossing	£55,000.00	

<b>7</b>	<b>Kingsnorth Road – Jemmett Road</b>	Woolreeds Road Beaver Lane Junction	"20mph 1 raised table Remove guardrail Toucan crossing"	£105,750.00	£305,000.00
		Beaver Lane - Junction Victoria Park "	"Resurfacing 20mph 2 raised tables"	£84,250.00	
		Victoria park Fountain – Picturehouse Cinema”	NA	NA	
		Picturehouse Cinema - Town Centre	Toucan crossing	£55,000.00	
<b>8</b>	<b>Beaver Road</b>	Beaver Lane - Bus Gate	"Reduce carriageway width 20mph"	£92,850.00	£200,000.00
		Bus Gate - Town Centre	"Segregated cycleway or shared use Signage"	£60,880.00	

<b>9</b>	<b>Newtown</b>	Newtown - Outlet Centre	20 mph - not sure if this is acceptable	£17,250.00	£30,000.00
		Outlet -Train station	S106 money allocated for this project	NA	
		Train station - underpass	Unknown	NA	
		Under pass - TC	Unknown	NA	

All costs are indicative at this stage and are subject to feasibility studies, site investigation and detailed design. Initial costs have been based on those made available by Wiltshire County Council. These costs may vary locally and be subject to inflation. Ashford Council at this time in writing does not have access to in-house design and costing experience.

## Chapter 4: Network planning for walking



## 4.1 Walking Route Selection

As active transport modes, many of the benefits of cycling and walking are shared and very often improvements for one will affect the other as large parts of the two networks overlap. For example, pedestrians and cyclists are often in close proximity and may share routes and crossings.

In most places a comprehensive network which accommodates most pedestrian trips already exists. Ashford Town Centre is well provided with paths and footways which offer an extensive network of routes many of which are traffic free and follow greenways and make use of open spaces and parks.

However, main roads which tend to be the most direct routes often have a poorer physical environment including narrow pavements with overgrown vegetation, infrequent crossing points, uneven surfaces and poorer air quality. People may be deterred from using them due to several issues, e.g. need to cross busy roads or because the facilities are poorly designed or maintained.

The main focus of the LCWIP is therefore to improve and in some cases extend the existing walking network in order to encourage people to make more short trips on foot.

With its good public transport connectivity, the Town Centre will be a focus for new business development – putting business at the heart of Ashford. The delivery of this major change programme in the heart of Ashford means that there needs to be a step change in street purpose and design. For each walking audit written comments and notes were taken as well as photos. Following each walking audit the loops were given preliminary scoring and a photo evidence document was created.

Once all the routes had been audited, the scoring was revised, moderated and the audit spreadsheet finalised. The spreadsheet was reviewed by another member of the team to provide unbiased judgement on the final scoring.

The next task involved creating summary tables to provide an overview of the walking routes and identify sections where projects would be implemented. The first summary table (4) provides the final total scoring for each category (attractiveness, comfort, directness, safety, coherence) for each walking loop as well as summarised written comments. This first summary table provides an overview of each walking loop.

A second summary table was produced. This one divided the large 2km walking routes into smaller sections allowing for a review of each route. A scoring for each category for each section was provided as well as a more detailed summary for each section. This second table served as a basis to divide each walking loop by section in order to identify specific projects and interventions.

An intervention spreadsheet was then created for the walking routes. This involved dividing each walking loop into smaller sections (the sections were informed by the summary tables aforementioned). Each section obtained a scoring (using the same methodology as for the walking audit looking at attractiveness, comfort, directness, safety and coherence for each section). This scoring was compared to the overall scoring that the entire walking loop obtained. Out of a total scoring of 40, sections that ranked from 0 to 20 were categorised as

'red', from 20 to 30 as 'amber', and from 30 to 40 as 'green'. This spreadsheet detailed the problems identified for each section as well as the potential interventions

This spreadsheet was used to produce maps representing each walking route and to spatially locate problems and their associated locations.

Finally, the intervention spreadsheet was used to complete the prioritisation spreadsheet which follows a similar format as the one produced for the cycling routes. This prioritisation spreadsheet looks at the proposed projects for each section, their costs, their effectiveness, economic value, deliverability and prioritisation.

#### **4.1.1 - Establishing Core Walking Zones**

**Map 6** (page 45) show the the CWZs identified for Ashford. It is based on a 400M radius around the Town Centre and Ashford International Train station.

#### **4.1.2 – Walking Network Plan**

Walking audits were conducted for five identified loops: four of these loops span 2km outwards starting from the ring road around Ashford's town centre and one loop is our core walking route through Ashford's town centre. Map 6 on page 45 shows main walking routes that were audited using the Walking Route Audit Tool (WRAT)

# Map 6

Main walking routes were audited using the Walking Route Audit Tool (WRAT)

- W1 (Core Walking Zones)
- W2
- W3
- W4
- W5
- Town Centre
- Schools
- Other Attractors
- LCWIP Boundary



## 4.2 – Walking Route Assessment

### 4.2.1 – Introduction

The audits followed the LCWIP Walking Route Audit Tool (WRAT) which assesses the five core design outputs including, attractiveness, comfort, directness, safety and coherence of a route using a red (0); amber (1); and green (2) scoring system.

Five core design outputs from the WRAT assessment are as follows:

**Attractiveness:** The audits evaluated the attractiveness of the walking routes by assessing the maintenance of footways, the presence of littering, the condition of street furniture, evidence of vandalism, whether there is natural surveillance or isolated routes, the levels of traffic noise and pollution, the presence of lighting, the use of guardrails and bollards, as well as the use of temporary features.

**Comfort:** Comfort was evaluated by looking at the condition of footways, the presence of crossovers resulting in uneven surface, fretted or subsided pavement, uneven patching or trenching, by estimating footway width and occasions of 'give and take', as well as looking at footway parking. The width on staggered crossing pedestrian islands and refuges and the gradient of slopes were evaluated. Temporary obstructions, barriers and gates restricting access, bus shelters restricting clearance width, and poorly drained footways were assessed.

**Directness:** The directness of footway provision and their ability to cater for pedestrian desire lines was evaluated. The location of crossings in relation to desire lines was assessed. The audits also looked at whether or not there were any delays in using the crossings by looking at the gaps in traffic. The impact of controlled crossings, such as single phase pelican puffin or zebra crossings on journey time were assessed by looking at whether or not any delays were created. Green man time was also assessed to determine if pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time.

**Safety:** Safety was assessed by looking at traffic volume and pedestrians' ability to keep distance from traffic. Traffic speed was also evaluated as well as visibility for all users.

**Coherence:** For coherence, the audits looked at the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving.

#### 4.2.2 - WRAT score summaries

**Table 6** shows the score obtained by the routes using the walking route audit tool (WRAT). The target is to score at least 70%, some routes are not achieving this, but future feasibility work may alter this score and ranking.

Route no	Route name	Attractiveness	Comfort	Directness	Safety	Coherence	Total (Score)	Total (%)	Ranking
W1 – S2	Town Centre High Street – Somerset Road	5	5	5	5	5	25	100	1
W1 – S3	Town Centre Bank Street – Elwick Road	5	5	5	5	5	25	100	1
W4 – S1	Hythe Road – Newtown Road	4	4	4	4	5	21	84	3
W3 – S3	Beaver Road – Beaver Lane	4	5	4	5	3	21	84	3
W2 – S5	Templar Way – Elwick Road	4	4	4	5	4	21	84	3
W1 – S4	Town centre – Beaver Road	5	3	4	4	4	20	80	6
W2 – S3	Maidstone Road – Repton Manor	5	4	4	3	3	19	76	7
W3 – S2	Beaver Road – Beaver Lane	5	3	4	4	3	19	76	7
W3 – S5	Jemmett Road – Victoria Park	4	4	4	3	4	19	76	7

<b>W1 – S1</b>	<b>Town Centre – East Hill</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>10</b>
W5 – S1	Kennington – Canterbury Road	4	4	4	3	2	17	68	11
W3 – S4	Beaver Road – Beaver Lane via Cryol Road	4	4	3	3	2	16	64	12
W2 – S2	Maidstone Road - Repton	3	3	3	4	3	16	64	12
W2 – S4	Repton - Repton	3	3	3	4	3	16	64	12
W5 – S3	Kennington – Bybrook	2	2	3	3	3	13	52	15
W3 – S1	Beaver Road – Beaver Lane	3	3	3	2	2	13	52	15
W5 – S6	M20 Road – Maidstone Road	2	2	4	3	2	13	52	15
W4 – S4	Hythe Road - Newtown	3	3	2	3	2	13	52	15
W5 – S5	Kennington – Bybrook Road	3	3	2	2	2	12	48	19
W5 – S4	Kennington – Park Vale Road	3	2	2	3	2	12	48	19

### 4.2.3. Details of proposed schemes and costings (Table 6)

Included in the total cost is allowances for design, project management, public consultation and road safety audits.

Route	Description	Sub-Description	Projects details	Estimated cost	Total cost (including approx. 44% of on costs, contingency, contractor etc.)
W1	Town Centre Core Walking Route	High Street- North Street- Somerset Road Crossing	Resurface cobblestones on High Street (200 meters total) 3 CCTV Camera on High Street and clean tags to increase safety Remove broken/bended guardrails on end of North Road- 2 guardrail Add 1 refuse bin on end North Road/Somerset Road crossing and organise collection	£76,000 (£380/meter) £1,500 £5,000 £200	£125,000

W1	Town Centre Core Walking Route	Bank Street- Tufton Street- Vicarage Lane- Church Road- Elwick Road	<p>Resurface Tufton Road (50m each side)</p> <p>Resurface Vicarage Lane (50m each side)</p> <p>Resurface Church Road (75m each side)</p> <p>Add tactile paving and dropped kerb on Tufton Road (for 4 crossings)</p> <p>Add tactile paving and dropped kerb on Vicarage Lane (for 4 crossings)</p> <p>Add tactile paving and dropped kerb on Church Road (for 8 crossings)</p> <p>Place-making interventions shared space (rethink shared space and increase safety/comfort of pedestrians add colourful crossings modal filter or Copenhagen crossings)</p>	<p>£18,000 (£180/meter)</p> <p>£18,000 (£180/meter)</p> <p>£27,000 (£180/meter)</p> <p>£10,000 (£105 for 10 Surface Mounted Tactile Paving Tiles &amp; Adhesive and £360 for 2 dropped kerbs for a 2-2.5m footway)</p> <p>£10,000 (£105 for 10 Surface Mounted Tactile Paving Tiles &amp; Adhesive and £360 for 2 dropped kerbs for a 2-2.5m footway)</p> <p>£20,000 (£105 for 10 Surface Mounted Tactile Paving Tiles &amp; Adhesive and £360 for 2 dropped kerbs for a 2-2.5m footway)</p> <p>£100,000</p>	£303,000
----	--------------------------------	---	--	--	----------

W4	Hythe Road to Newtown Road	Start Tesco at Mills Court- Hythe Road to M20 Junction including Criquet Footway and Footway Hythe Road to Highfield Road	<p>Add 5 highlighted crossing and traffic calming measures along Hythe Road with dropped kerbs and tactile paving</p> <p>Add 5 refuse bins on Hythe Road.</p> <p>Resurface Hythe Road (beginning) (50 meters each side)</p> <p>Remove guardrails- minimum 15 guardrails</p> <p>Add dropped kerbs on Hythe Road crossing and pedestrian islands (Mabeldon Avenue and Romney Road) (for 5 crossings on each side/total 10)</p> <p>Remove 2 signage for public footways</p> <p>Clean public footways- maintenance</p>	<p>£38,000</p> <p>£1,000</p> <p>£18,000</p> <p>£15,000</p> <p>£10,000</p> <p>£500 (£250 for removal signage)</p> <p>£3,000</p>	£125,500
----	----------------------------	---	--	--	----------

W3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	Stanhope Road to Athol Road	<p>Cut overgrown vegetation on Stanhope Road before roundabout- maintenance</p> <p>Add 4 highlight crossing and pedestrian island on Stanhope Road Roundabout with dropped kerbs and tactile paving and remove existing pedestrian island. Use continuous footway crossing if possible.</p> <p>Add dropped kerbs and tactile paving for Stanhope Road Roundabout crossing (for 8 crossings 4 crossings each side)</p> <p>Remove guardrails on Stanhope Road- old guardrails at least 30-50 meters</p>	<p>£500</p> <p>£30,000</p> <p>£5,000</p> <p>£30,000</p>	£95,500
----	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---	---	---------

W5	Conningbrook Kennington Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	Start Council- Green Path from Mill Court to Raymond Fuller Way	Paint lines on walking cycling shared path (removal and repainting) for 200 meters (use colourful crossing with community input) Cut overgrown vegetation along walking cycling shared path- maintenance Add 1 CCTV in tunnel Add permanent lighting in tunnel Address desired crossing lines before tunnel- place- making intervention Remove tags on bins at start of path- maintenance	£7,200 (£29 per meter for removal and £7 per meter for painting) £1,000 £500 £3,000 £5,000 £500	£34,500
W2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	Orchard Heights Residential Streets: Landburry Walk- Warren View- Orchard Heights	Cut overgrown vegetation- maintenance Add minimum 3 signs through residential streets	£1,000 £1,200	£3,200

W3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	Beaver Road- Kingsnorth Road until Stanhope Corner	Resurface Beaver Road - especially in front of Beaver Inn (100 meters each side) Resurface Kingsnorth Road (100 meters each side) Remove guardrails (especially crossing to Kingsnorth Road and intersection Christchurch Road)- minimum 20 guardrails Add 5 highlighted crossings on Beaver Road with dropped kerbs and tactile paving	£36,000 £36,000 £20,000 £30,000 (£5,000 per crossing £360 for 2 dropped kerbs and £105 for paving)	£232,000
W3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	Jemmett Road- Victoria Park- End Victoria Park Bridge	Plant 10 tree on Jemmett Road for shading Remove tags on Victoria bridge- maintenance Change cycle counter in Victoria Park	£10,000 £500 £10,000	£30,500
W1	Town Centre Core Walking Route	Elwick Bridge to Victoria Road- Leacon Road- Victoria Road- Beaver Road Crossing- End Curious Brewery	Clean tags on Elwick Bridge- maintenance Resurface stairs Elwick Bridge (10 meters total) Add 3 CCTV camera to Elwick Bridge to increase safety Plant 10 trees along Victoria Lane for shading and add bees patch on bus shelters. Add zebra crossing on Victoria Road (Aldi) Add 2 pedestrian islands along Victoria Road with highlighted crossings	£1,000 £1,800 (£180/meter) £1,500 £10,000 (£100 per tree) £30,000 £30,000 (£10,000 per pedestrian island and £5,000 for pedestrian island)	£115,000

W2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	Templer Way- Godinton Road- Carlton Roundabout- Sackville Crescent- Godinton Road- End Elwick Road	Place making intervention for Carlton Roundabout (link with Chilmington Green junction improvement introduce play streets modal filters and colourful crossing) Add dropped kerbs and tactile paving on Godinton Road crossings for 10 crossings (5 each side) Resurface potholes Godinton Road (100 each side) KCC	£1,500,000 (see Chilmington) £30,000 £36,000	£2,066,000
W4	Hythe Road to Newtown Road	Residential Roads: Highfield Road- Sevington Road- Church Road	Add highlighted crossing end of Church Road to reach church courtyard with dropped kerbs and tactile paving Add dropped kerbs and tactile paving at Julien Place Luckhurst Road and Pemberton Road (3 crossings)	£7,000 £5,000	£22,000
W5	Conningbrook Kennington Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	Residential Streets: Raymond Fuller Way- Clarke Crescent- George Williams Way to Canterbury Road- Willesborough Road	Cut overgrown vegetation on George Williams Way- maintenance Add 3 pedestrian islands with tactile paving and dropped kerbs on George Williams Way roundabout crossing	£500 £40,000 (£10,000 per pedestrian island)	£60,500

W1	Town Centre Core Walking Route	Start Council- East Hill	Pedestrianise East Hill (place-making interventions such as colourful crossings or the use of modal filters or school speed restrictions) Remove guardrails (if pedestrianised everywhere- if not pedestrianised everywhere except in front of school) - 1 to 15 guardrails	£50,000 £1,000-£15,000	£71,000 - £95,000
W4	Hythe Road to Newtown Road	Bentley Road- Hunter Avenue- Tunnel New Town Road	Add 1 zebra crossing on Hunter Avenue with dropped kerbs and tactile paving Plant 10 trees on Bentley Avenue for shading	£35,000 £10,000	£65,000
W2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	Repton Manor Residential Streets: Barley Mow View- Sir John Fogge Avenue- Repton Avenue	Add 1 zebra crossing on Repton Avenue (Waitrose) Remove guardrails at crossing with Templar Way- minimum 10 guardrails	£30,000 £10,000	£60,000

W4	Hythe Road to Newtown Road	New Town Road to Tunnel to Train Station- End Train Station	<p>Add 3 highlight crossing for Newtown Road lateral crossing with dropped kerbs and tactile paving  Add 1 zebra crossing on Newtown Road reaching Ellison Road  Add 3 refuse bins on Newtown Road  Remove broken street furniture on Newtown Road- maintenance  Add CCTV tunnel to station  Add permanent lighting in tunnel to station  Remove tags tunnel- maintenance artwork by community</p>	<p>£20,000  £30,000  £600  £3,000  £500  £2,000  £2,000</p>	£90,000
W2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	Start High Street- New Street- New Street and Chart Road Roundabout- Maidstone Road to Templer Way Roundabout	<p>Resurfacing paving around Chart Road Roundabout (50 meters total)  Remove tags on street furniture on Chart Road- maintenance  Remove guardrails on Chart Road and Maidstone Road- up to 20 guardrails</p>	<p>£9,000 (£180/meter)  £500  £20,000</p>	£40,000

W3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	Residential Streets Athol Road- St Stephens Walk- Cryol Road- Beaver Lane	Add 2 refuse bins on Cryol Road Modify crossing at the Athol Road/St Stephens Walk and at Cryol Road/Beaver Lane: remove pedestrian islands and add four highlighted crossings with dropped kerbs and tactile paving per crossing use continuous footway crossing if possible Resurface Beaver Lane (100 meters each side) Plant 10 trees on Beaver Lane for shading	£500 £60,000 £36,000 £10,000	£160,000
W2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	Maidstone Road - Orchard Heights Roundabout	Add 3 double highlighted crossings on Maidstone Road to reach bus stops with dropped kerbs (total 6 crossings due to length of road and tactile paving Add 4 signage to indicate end of path Add 4 CCTV for security along Maidstone Road	£36,000 (£5,000 per highlighted crossings with £360 for 2 dropped kerbs and £105 for paving) £1,600 (£400 per signage) £2,000	£60,000

W5	Conningbrook Kennington Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	Canterbury Road from Willesborough Road crossing to M20 Crossing	Add 4 highlighted crossings on Canterbury Road especially near bus stops with dropped kerbs and tactile paving Add traffic calming measures on Canterbury Road- minimum 2 splitter islands and think about using modal filters Resurface Canterbury Road (start/end) (500 meters each side)	£30,000 £20,000 (£10,000 per splitter islands) £180,000	£330,000
W5	Conningbrook Kennington Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	Canterbury Road from M20- Magazine Road- Malvern Road- Quantock Drive - End Maidstone Road	Add 1 puffin crossing at Magazine/Canterbury Road crossing Add traffic calming measures on Canterbury Road- minimum 2 splitter islands and add of modal filters and colourful crossings	£55,000 £20,000 (£10,000 per splitter islands)	£125,000
W5	Conningbrook Kennington Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	Brybrooke Road- Kinney Lane	Plan 10 trees for shading on Brybrooke Road and add bee patch on bus stops Place-making Kinney Lane, pedestrianise for access to shared path (private road ownership issue) Add dropped kerbs and tactile paving on Brybrooke Road crossings (for 10 crossings 5 per sides) Resurface Brybrooke Road (100 meters per side)	£10,000 £50,000 £12,000 £36,000	£158,000

W3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	Start Train Station- Beaver Road and Jacques Fauchaux Crossing- Beaver Road until Bond Road corner	Address lights at Jacques Fauchaux crossing (red light shorter/green light longer for pedestrian) Resurface Beaver Road (100 meters each side)	£500 £36,000	£56,500
W5	Conningbrook Kennington Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	Faversham Road from crossing with Canterbury Road- Park Road-Park Vale	Remove guardrails on Faversham/Canterbury crossing- minimum 10 guardrails up to 20 guardrails Add 3 zebra crossing across Faversham/Canterbury crossing Add dropped kerbs and tactile paving on Park Road (for 6 crossings) Add dropped kerbs and tactile paving on Park Vale (for 4 crossings)	£30,000 £10,000-20,000 £5,500 £3,500	£69,000 - £89,000

All costs are indicative at this stage and are subject to feasibility studies, site investigation and detailed design. Initial costs have been based on those made available by from Wiltshire County Council. These costs may vary locally and be subject to inflation. Ashford Council at this time in writing does not have access to in-house design and costing experience.

## Chapter 5: Prioritisation of schemes



This chapter sets out the approach of prioritising the cycling and walking infrastructure improvements in the short, medium and long term.

- Short term (typically <3 years) – improvements which can be implemented quickly or are under development
- Medium term (typically <5 years) improvements where there is a clear intention to act, but delivery is dependent on further funding available
- Long term (typically > 5 years) more aspirational improvements or these awaiting a defined solution.

All planned infrastructure changes that impact on residents will go through the appropriate consultation process required with direct discussion with affected users groups and with reference to relevant design guidance, e.g. consultation with mobility groups such as RNIB (Royal National Institute of Blind People), Ashford Access Group and use of documents such as the “Wheels for Wellbeing guidance”.

## 5.0 - Ashford Walking and Cycling Prioritisation and rationale of schemes

Cycling schemes have been prioritised against a range of criteria as follows:

### Effectiveness Criteria

Existing **Route Comfort and attractiveness** were assessed during the route project/scheme selection process. An identified project which improves the route comfort and attractiveness for users is likely to attract and encourage increased future usage and therefore where a benefit is identified, a project/scheme is scored positively.

**Links with existing route/network** is an important consideration when assessing whether a project is likely to make improvements which will encourage increased usage of cycle paths and pedestrian footpaths.

Whether a project/scheme leads to creating a **Road safety improvement** is an important aspect of assessing its effectiveness. Where projects are likely to improve security and safety measures for cyclists and pedestrians by raising awareness of cyclists/pedestrians in the area, reducing speeds of other modes of transport, or segregating the active mode from traffic, this project will score more positively.

**Policy Links - The Ashford Green Corridor Network** is an important aspect of the towns green infrastructure, but also a key movement network for pedestrians and cyclists which is mostly vehicle free. The recently adopted Green Corridor action plan<sup>[1]</sup> and Local Plan Policy ENV2<sup>[2]</sup> encourages improvements and enhancements to the network.

---

<sup>[1]</sup> <https://www.ashford.gov.uk/media/5476/green-corridor-action-plan-2017.pdf>

<sup>[2]</sup> <https://www.ashford.gov.uk/media/7542/adopted-ashford-local-plan-2030-2.pdf>

**Improving links to schools and local services** such as transport hubs, retail, community and leisure facilities for the active travel mode is a key aim of the project. Determining the purpose of users' journeys, and in particular between children and adults is identified as an important aspect of prioritisation assessment within the AMAT tool (2.5). When undertaking the route selection process, which are located around the Town Centre, it was identified that many of the active mode users were school children accessing the several schools with the routes, and adults accessing the town centre shops and services or commuting to work or the train station, which links several of the routes. Part of the assessment therefore scores projects positively where they will be likely to improve accessibility by active mode to one of these key areas, and have safety and time saving impacts.

**Table 7 shows the prioritised cycling schemes**

Scheme Description					Effectiveness					Economic		Deliverability			Prioritisation	
Route	Description	Sub-Section	Sub-Description	Projects details	Route Comfort and attractiveness improvement	Links with existing route/network	Creates Road safety improvement	Link to Green Corridor network	Links to Schools and local services	Value for money	Funding potential	Political Support	Timescale	Feasibility	Total Score	Ranking
1	Hythe Road - Mace Lane	B	Petrol Station - Roundabout	20mph public realm improvements crossing points	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	1	1	13	9
1	Hythe Road - Mace Lane	C	Roundabout - Town Centre	Segregated cycleway and public realm improvement	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	12	11
1	Hythe Road - Mace Lane	A	Bridge - Petrol Station	20mph public realm improvements crossing points	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	2	1	1	9	18
2	Faversham - Canterbury Road	A	Faversham Road - Bridge	Light segregation Toucan	2	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	1	2	16	2

2	Bridge - Town centre	B	Bridge - Town centre	Living street Approach Improvement to bridge Improvement to public realm Traffic flow study Small improvement to pavement linking bridge to Heathfield Road	2	2	2	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	10	17
3	Highworth/ A20	B	Drovers - Barrowhill	Reduce capacity to provide segregated cycle lane North or South bound to be establish which is best. Toucan crossing	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	12	11
3	Highworth/ A20	C	Barrowhill - Town Centre	Reduce capacity roundabout north bound to provide space Raised table entry	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	12	11

				Barrowhill Increase width shared footpath Northbound Lidl car park Improve junction car parks Lidl and Barnardos												
3	Highworth/ A20	A	Orchard Heights - Drovers	Widen footpath cycleways Move bus stop Toucan crossing Potentially continue footpath cycleway northbound	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	7	19
4	Repton Way	B	Western Avenue JCT - Bolt	Raised table Speed cushion Signage 20mph	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	2	1	2	12	11
4	Repton Way	A	Tank RB - Western Avenue JCT	Toucan Crossing 20 mph Living street Drop kerbs	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	21

4	Repton Way	C	Bolt - Picturehouse	NA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	22
4	Repton Way	D	Cinema - Town Centre	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
5	Victoria Park	C	Victoria park Fountain - Pitcurehouse	Toucan crossing	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	1	2	16	2
5	Victoria Park	A	Brookfield road - Hillbrow Lane	NA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	22
5	Victoria Park	B	Hillbrow Lane - Victoria park Fountain	NA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	22
5	Victoria Park	D	Picturehouse - Town Centre	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
6	Ashford Oak	A	Arlington – Noakes Meadow	20mph	1	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	15	4
6	Ashford Oak	B	Noakes Meadow- Jemmett Road	NA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	27
6	Ashford Oak	C	Jemmett Road – Victoria Park Fountain	Improve shared footpath cycleway, signage and painting parking restriction to widen footpath	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	19	1
6	Ashford Oak	D	Victoria Park fountain – Picturehouse	NA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	22

6	Ashford Oak	E	Pitcurehouse – town centre	Toucan crossing	1	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	1	2	14	5
7	Jemmett Road	A	Woolreeds Road – Beaver Lane Junction	20mph 1 raised table Remove guardrail Toucan crossing	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	11	15
7	Jemmett Road	B	Beaver Lane – Junction Victoria Park	Resurfacing 20mph 2 raised tables	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	1	1	2	13	9
7	Jemmett Road	C	Victoria Park fountain – Picturehouse	NA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	22
7	Jemmett Road	D	Picturehouse – town centre	Toucan crossing	1	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	1	2	14	5
8	Beaver Road	A	Beaver Lane – Bus gate	20mph	1	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	14	5
8	Beaver Road	B	Bus gate – town centre	Segregated cycleway or shared use Signage	2	2	2	0	1	0	2	2	1	2	14	5
9	Newtown	A	Newtown – Outlet Centre	20mph	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	7	19
9	Newtown	B	Outlet Centre – Train station	Tidy and signage	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	11	15

**Table 8 Walking Scheme Prioritisation**

Scheme Description				Effectiveness					Economic		Deliverability			Prioritisation	
Route	Description	Sub-Section	Sub-Description	Route Comfort and attractiveness improvement	Links with existing route/network	Creates Road safety improvement	Link to Green Corridor network	Links to Schools and local services	Value for money	Funding potential	Political Support	Timescale	Feasibility	Total Score	Ranking
W 1	Town Centre Core Walking Route	S 2	High Street- North Street-Somerset Road Crossing	2	2	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	1	38	1
W 1	Town Centre Core Walking Route	S 3	Bank Street- Tufton Street- Vicarage Lane- Church Road- Elwick Road	1	2	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	1	37	2
W 4	Hythe Road to Newtown Road	S 1	Start Tesco at Mills Court- Hythe Road to M20 Junction including Criquet Footway and Footway Hythe Road to Highfield Road	2	2	2	0	2	2	1	1	0	1	34	3

W 3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	S 3	Stanhope Road to Athol Road		2	2	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>
W 5	Conningbr ook Kenningto n Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	S 1	Start Council- Green Path from Mill Court to Raymond Fuller Way		2	1	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>
W 2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	S 3	Orchard Heights Residential Streets: Landbury Walk- Warren View-Orchard Heights		1	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	<b>32</b>	<b>5</b>
W 3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	S 2	Beaver Road- Kingsnorth Road until Stanhope Corner		2	2	1	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	<b>32</b>	<b>5</b>

W 3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	S 5	Jemmett Road- Victoria Park- End Victoria Park Bridge	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	<b>32</b>	<b>5</b>
W 1	Town Centre Core Walking Route	S 4	Elwick Bridge to Victoria Road- Leacon Road- Victoria Road- Beaver Road Crossing- End Curious Brewery	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	<b>31</b>	<b>6</b>
W 2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	S 5	Templer Way- Godinton Road- Carlton Roundabout- Sackville Crescent- Godinton Road- End Elwick Road	2	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	<b>29</b>	<b>7</b>
W 4	Hythe Road to Newtown Road	S 2	Residential Roads: Highfield Road- Sevington Road- Church Road	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>
W 5	Conningbr ook Kenningto n Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	S 2	Residential Streets: Raymond Fuller Way- Clarke Crescent- George Williams Way to Canterbury Road- Willesborough Road	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>

W 1	Town Centre Core Walking Route	S 1	Start Council- East Hill		2	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	<b>27</b>	<b>9</b>
W 4	Hythe Road to Newtown Road	S 3	Bentley Road- Hunter Avenue- Tunnel New Town Road		2	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	2	1	<b>26</b>	<b>10</b>
W 2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	S 4	Repton Manor Residential Streets: Barley Mow View- Sir John Fogge Avenue- Repton Avenue		1	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	<b>25</b>	<b>11</b>
W 4	Hythe Road to Newtown Road	S 4	New Town Road to Tunnel to Train Station- End Train Station		2	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	<b>25</b>	<b>11</b>
W 2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	S 1	Start High Street- New Street- New Street and Chart Road Roundabout- Maidstone Road to Templer Way Roundabout		2	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	<b>24</b>	<b>12</b>

W 3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	S 4	Residential Streets Athol Road- St Stephens Walk- Cryol Road- Beaver Lane	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	<b>24</b>	<b>12</b>
W 2	Maidstone Road to Orchard Heights and Repton Manor	S 2	Maidstone Road - Orchard Heights Roundabout	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>
W 5	Conningbr ook Kenningto n Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	S 3	Canterbury Road from Willesborough Road crossing to M20 Crossing	1	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>
W 5	Conningbr ook Kenningto n Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	S 6	Canterbury Road from M20- Magazine Road- Malvern Road- Quantock Drive -End Maidstone Road	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>

W 5	Conningbrook Kennington Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	S 5	Brybrooke Road-Kinney Lane		2	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>
W 3	Beaver Road Stanhope and Beaver Lane	S 1	Start Train Station- Beaver Road and Jacques Faucheux Crossing- Beaver Road until Bond Road corner		1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	<b>19</b>	<b>16</b>
W 5	Conningbrook Kennington Faversham Brybrooke Canterbury Road	S 4	Faversham Road from crossing with Canterbury Road-Park Road-Park Vale		1	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	<b>19</b>	

The following details how prioritisation of the categories was decided on walking routes:

- **Attractiveness:** The audits evaluated the attractiveness of the walking routes by assessing the maintenance of footways, the presence of littering, the condition of street furniture, evidence of vandalism, whether there is natural surveillance or isolated routes, the levels of traffic noise and pollution, the presence of lighting, the use of guardrails and bollards, as well as the use of temporary features.
- **Comfort:** Comfort was evaluated by looking at the condition of footways, the presence of crossovers resulting in uneven surface fretted or subsided pavement uneven patching or trenching, by estimating footway width and occasions of 'give and take', as well as looking at footway parking. The width on staggered crossings pedestrian islands and refuges and the gradient of slopes were evaluated. Temporary obstructions, barriers and gates restricting access, bus shelters restricting clearance width, and poorly drained footways were assessed.
- **Directness:** The directness of footway provision and their ability to cater for pedestrian desire lines was evaluated. The location of crossings in relation to desire lines was assessed. The audits also looked at whether or not there were any delays in using the crossings by looking at the gaps in traffic. The impact of controlled crossings, such as single phase pelican puffin or zebra crossings on journey time were assessed by looking at whether or not any delays were created. Green man time was also assessed to determine if pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time. Other directness aspects inspected included routes to and from bus not accommodated, steps restricting access for all users, and confusing layout for pedestrians.
- **Safety:** Safety was assessed by looking at traffic volume and pedestrians' ability to keep distance from traffic. Traffic speed was also evaluated as well as visibility for all users.
- **Coherence:** For coherence, the audits looked at the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving.

The process undertaken to prioritise the identified projects follows the principles set out in the Department for Transport's (DfT) Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Technical guidance (Chapter 7) <sup>1</sup> whilst also taking into consideration the DfT Active Mode Appraisal guidance (AMAT)<sup>2</sup> and a range of local assessments. This includes assessing the effectiveness of the project when assessed against a range of criteria, including links to local policies.

The prioritisation process also makes an assessment of each project based on an economic assessment which considers whether the project is value for money and can attract funding and overall deliverability. This assesses the timescales for delivery of the project over the short, medium and long term, and deliverability of the projects based on likely political support and feasibility.

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/607016/cycling-walking-infrastructure-technical-guidance.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/607016/cycling-walking-infrastructure-technical-guidance.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/webtag-tag-unit-a5-1-active-mode-appraisal-may-2018>

The scoring method is below:

0	No Positive Impact
1	Low Positive Impact
2	High Positive Impact

The scoring criteria assessments are explained in more detail below:

### **Effectiveness Criteria**

Existing **Route Comfort and attractiveness** were assessed during the route project/scheme selection process. An identified project which improves the route comfort and attractiveness for users is likely to attract and encourage increased future usage and therefore where a benefit is identified, a project/scheme is scored positively.

**Links with existing route/network** is an important consideration when assessing whether a project is likely to make improvements which will encourage increased usage of cycle paths and pedestrian footpaths.

Whether a project/scheme leads to creating a **Road safety improvement** is an important aspect of assessing its effectiveness. Where projects are likely to improve security and safety measures for cyclists and pedestrians by raising awareness of cyclists/pedestrians in the area, reducing speeds of other modes of transport, or segregating the active mode from traffic, this project will score more positively.

**Policy Links - The Ashford Green Corridor Network** is an important aspect of the towns green infrastructure, but also a key movement network for pedestrians and cyclists which is mostly vehicle free. The recently adopted Green Corridor action plan<sup>3</sup> and Local Plan Policy ENV2<sup>4</sup> encourages improvements to the network

**Improving links to schools and local services** such as transport hubs, retail, community and leisure facilities for the active travel mode is a key aim of the project. Determining the purpose of users journeys, and in particular between children and adults is identified as an important aspect of prioritisation assessment within the AMAT tool (2.5). When undertaking the route selection process, which are located around the Town Centre, it was identified that many of the active mode users were school children accessing the several schools with the routes, and adults accessing the town centre shops and services or commuting to work or the train station, which links several of the routes. Part of the assessment therefore scores projects positively where they will be likely to improve accessibility by active mode to one of these key areas, and have safety and time saving impacts.

**Value for money and funding potential** assesses the cost of the project, either low, medium or high.

**Political support** (elected members, members of the public and government agencies) is crucial for a number of reasons when agreeing suggested improvements.

**Delivery Timescales** and whether realistically the scheme can be delivered within a short, medium or long term aspiration

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ashford.gov.uk/media/5476/green-corridor-action-plan-2017.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.ashford.gov.uk/media/7542/adopted-ashford-local-plan-2030-2.pdf>

Feasibility of delivery is one of the key aspects, there are a number of factors including land ownership, impact on other users, costs, ongoing maintenance, and the quality of the land, heritage factors and demand.

## 5.1 – Route Rationale with stakeholders

This section categorises each route as high, low and medium priority. This reflects the above prioritisation exercise, together with review by KCC as the Highway Authority with responsibility for implementing these measures.

### Route 1 - Hythe Road – Mace Lane

**Priority** = High

**Timescale** = Long

**Feasibility** = Medium

#### **Link 1: Somerset Road/Mace Lane (between Forge Lane – Mill Court Roundabout)**

Little design scope (even for shared use facilities) within the existing highways configuration, particularly between Forge Lane and Wellesley Road) for improving cycle facilities. This section would need significant investment and re-design to deliver high quality cycle infrastructure. Space for protected cycle facilities and improved cycle facilities could be gained from reducing existing lane widths and removal of central median. Complimentary junction improvements would also be required along the route.

#### **Link 2: Hythe Road (between Mill Court Roundabout – Mabledon Avenue (Esso Garage)**

The design for the whole route is most constrained between the roundabout and Esso Garage, and there is little scope for installing segregated facilities. An alternative approach could be to focus on streetscape improvements that improve the overall environment for pedestrians and cyclists without protected cycle facilities. Any improvements for cycling would require modifications to existing kerbside restrictions.

#### **Link 3: Hythe Road II (Mabledon Avenue (Esso Garage) – Railway Bridge)**

Introduction of new on-street cycle facilities could be created through removal of existing central hatching between Esso Garage and the Railway Bridge. Any improvements for cycling would require modifications to existing kerbside restrictions.

#### **Link 4: East of Railway Bridge**

Connect route beyond the railway bridge

Essella Road – Osbourne Road link has been considered as a complimentary feeder route.

## Route 2 - Canterbury / Faversham Road

**Priority** = High

**Timescale** = Medium

**Feasibility** = Medium

### **Link 3: Canterbury Road to road bridge at junction with Simone Weil Avenue**

The Junction would need upgrading to incorporate cycle facilities. Junction with Bybrook Road would also need improving.

Link into Kinney's Lane should also be upgraded and made easier to connect too.

Convert existing NB cycle facilities into permanent protected facilities. Design would include floating bus stops, revised kerbside restrictions and treatments of side-entry arms.

Existing SB cycle facilities could also be upgraded to segregated cycle facilities. There is scope to introduce protected cycle facilities within the existing SB bus lane by reducing width of central hatching/median.

Existing footways over M20 bridge would need upgrading to shared use as there isn't sufficient width available for protected facilities. Junction with M20, slip would require incorporation of cycle facilities e.g. ASLs.

### **Link 4a: Bridge to Town Centre**

Existing shared use facilities are substandard and not wide enough to be comfortably shared by cycles + pedestrians.

Section between M20 junction and Magazine Road could incorporate protected cycle facilities through removal of central hatching. Side-entry junctions, including Heathfield Road, will need lightening.

### **Link 4b: Bridge to Town Centre**

Design scope is limited by narrow carriageway and narrow footways. Recommendation to consider 'Healthy Streets' measures to calm traffic and reduce speeds = sinusoidal humps + reduce speed limit.

Consider cycles negotiating the Somerset Road junction? Existing crossings are toucans but the islands are very narrow on the junction.

**Recommendation** - Consideration to the onward connection into the town centre. Cyclists will use Park Street. Improvement needs to take place to be more amenable environment for cycling.

## Route 3 - Highworth /A20 = Long Term

**Priority** = Medium

**Timescale** = Long

**Feasibility** = Low

### **Link 1: A20 (Orchard Heights – Drovers Roundabout)**

Scope for improvement on cycle/footway.

- North side - as route appears to end and narrow after Orchard Heights. This gap in route should be filled. Headway treatments at junctions with Champion Close should be considered.
- South side – install new path to connect between bus stop and Orchard Heights junction.

### **Link 2: A292 (Drovers to Barrow Hill)**

Existing shared use facilities require significant investment to be considered comfortable for pedestrians and cycles to use, and the alternative for introducing dedicated cycle facilities will require redesign of existing corridor.

Existing shared use facilities on north side are of poor quality – they would require widening and headway treatments. South side is not currently labelled as shared use and is not suitable for conversion either.

Any significant improvements for cycling on Link 2 would require reconfiguration of existing highways layout including the Gyratory system around the Barrow Hill Veterinary School.

### **Link 3: A292 (Barrow Hill to Forge Lane Junction)**

Existing shared use facilities are narrow and part of popular walking route to town centre.

Similarly, to Link 2, significant rethink of existing highway layout would be required to introduce protected cycle facilities.

### **Link 4: Magazine Road (Barrow Hill – Canterbury Road)**

Existing shared use facilities are narrow and compromised by frequent vehicle crossovers and side entry junctions. Small improvements could be made at junctions and pinch points but the route would still not generate a high score from the RST. The design scope for wider improvements depends on the available widths

## Route 4 - Repton

**Priority** = Medium

**Timescale** = Short

**Feasibility** = High

### **Link 1:** Carlton Road (Tank Roundabout - Western Avenue)

Improve entry treatment of Bridge Road/Carlton Road and continue cycle facility north towards Tank Roundabout. Remove existing verge and convert to shared use path.

Install crossing facility on Carlton Road to connect existing cycle facilities from railway bridge.

### **Link 2: Godinton Road (Western Avenue – West Street)**

Improve tie-in of existing cycle link at junction of Gasworks Lane. Reduce corner radii and consider raised table. Consider 'Healthy Streets' measures to calm traffic and reduce speeds = sinusoidal humps + reduce speed limit.

### **Link 3: Elwick Road (West Street – Bank Street)**

Existing on-street conditions are sufficient

**Link 4:** Bank Street

## Route 5 - Victoria Park

**Priority** = High

**Timescale** = Short

**Feasibility** = High

Improved scores for Comfort for park sections as I think existing facilities should be considered as 3- 3.5m wide.

## Route 6 - Ashford Oak

**Priority** = Low

**Timescale** = Medium

**Feasibility** = High

### **Link 1: Arlington – Noakes Meadow**

Cyclists could be on carriageway - Route would benefit from traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds and make more comfortable for cycling. Junction of Noakes Meadow/ Jemmett Road should be upgraded to raise awareness of cycle manoeuvres at junction.

Route would require wayfinding as otherwise could be quite hard to find in residential area.

### **Link 2: Noakes Meadows – Jemmett Road**

Cyclists could be on carriageway - Route would benefit from traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds and make more comfortable for cycling. Good existing connection from Noakes Meadow across playing fields.

### **Link 3: Jemmett Road – Victoria Park**

Cyclists could be on carriageway - Route would benefit from traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds and make more comfortable for cycling. Existing shared use path on western footway is very narrow and cycling on carriageway would be more comfortable.

## Route 7 - Jemmett Road

**Priority** = High  
**Timescale** = Short  
**Feasibility** = High

### **Link 1: Woolreeds Road**

Considered raised table at junction with Cryol Road to provide link into park, and at junction with Arcon Road to improve link into shared use path. Consider traffic calming on Woolreeds Road to improve cycle comfort. Reduce speed limit to 20mph. De-clutter shared use path between Arcon Road and Beaver Lane. Install toucan/parallel zebra crossing across Beaver Lane and convert adjoining footways to shared use.

### **Link 2: Jemmett Road – Noakes Meadow**

Cyclists could be on carriageway - Route would benefit from traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds and make more comfortable for cycling

## Route 8 - Beaver Road

**Priority** = Medium  
**Timescale** = Medium  
**Feasibility** = High

Introduce segregated cycle facilities on Beavers, possibly as part of wider corridor improvements on Beavers Lane and Brookfield Road. No cycle facilities at Beaver Lane/ Beaver Road/ Norman Road junction.

### **Link 1: Beaver Road North – Bus Gate**

Narrow carriageway and on-street parking restrict design scope for Beaver Road. Traffic calming such as Sinusoidal Humps would help to create more comfortable conditions for cycling and reduce vehicle speeds.

### **Link 2: Bus Gate – Bridge**

Existing streetscape is very industrial and not conducive to cycling, and the current shared use facilities are of poor quality. Unclear of the extents of the shared use facilities at junction with Victoria Road and how cyclists join them. Carriageway is very wide.

## Route 9 - Newtown

**Priority** = High  
**Timescale** = Medium  
**Feasibility** = Medium

### **Link 1: Newtown Road (Turner Close to Outlet Entry)**

Junction improvements at junction of Turner Close/Newtown Road to raise profile of junction and merging cycle routes. Raised junction would help achieve this.

Consider 'Healthy Streets' measures on Newtown Road to calm traffic and reduce speeds = Sinusoidal humps + reduce speed limit. Scope for protected cycle facilities is limited by existing narrow carriageway dimensions and bus facilities further complicate.

Existing roundabout is not suitable for cycling and crossing facilities are also poor for pedestrians.

***Link 2: Station Access Road (Outlet Entry to Town Centre)***

Existing facilities could be improved by incorporating adjoining verge within shared use. Consider junction improvements at junction of Station Access Road/ Park/ Car Park Access to raise awareness of pedestrians and cycles using the junction.

***Link 3: Station onwards to town centre***

## Chapter 6: Integration and application



## 6.1 - Policy integration

### 6.1.1 - Links to wider strategies and complementary measures

#### *Recommendations*

- Council will consider adoption of LCWIP as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (As standalone or as part of other emerging SPDs)
- To consult on LCWIP and promote its adoption by elected members as supporting evidence to the Development Plan
- Linking the LCWIP to the Carbon Neutral by 2030 Pledge
- Linking the LCWIP to the Corporate Plan objectives. Recommendation would be that if and when the LCWIP is adopted it is reviewed every 5 years
- Linking the LCWIP to the implementation of the Ashford Cycling and Walking Strategy 2019 - 2029.

## 6.2 - Funding and implementation

Delivery of key elements of this cycle network is dependent on available funding. A variety of funding sources are available to us, but at time of publication there is no specific government funding for delivering LCWIPs. All applications for external funding will be sourced alongside key stakeholders.

Securing substantially increased funding for cycling in Ashford is key to truly integrating cycling into all local transport and planning projects, to ensuring that cycling provision is ambitious and designed to a high standard, and to ensuring that cycling is integral to other transport networks.

The identified infrastructure will be delivered via a variety of mechanisms, including delivery by the Council and its partners and through development proposals. As well as its own internal resources, the Council will pursue external funding, particularly given that many of the proposed actions will have positive benefits for many stakeholders

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a mechanism introduced under the Planning Act 2008 which aims to provide a more consistent approach to determining financial contributions from new development towards local infrastructure provision. The proceeds of the levy can contribute towards local and sub-regional infrastructure to support the development of an area in line with local authorities' development plans, which can include roads and transport schemes. These projects are identified in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The Council is considering how to bring forward CIL in the borough of Ashford, and intend to consult on proposals in early 2020 but projects identified in the LCWIP could be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and funding statement.

These mechanisms together will assist to enable ABC to seek appropriate contributions to the provision of walking and cycling infrastructure identified in the LCWIP through CIL funding or planning agreements in the form of Section 106 obligations or Section 278 highway agreements.

### **6.3 - Monitoring**

The Ashford Local Plan 2030 was adopted in February 2019. It includes requirements under policies TRA5 and TRA6 to plan for pedestrians and cyclists as part of development schemes. Policy TRA8 of the Local Plan 2030 requires Transport Assessments or Statements to be submitted as part of larger schemes, which would need to address walking and cycling and local and wider connections to active travel modes. The effectiveness of these policies are monitored annually as part of the Authority Monitoring Report, through indicators set out in Appendix 6 of the Local Plan.

Ashford will also consider incorporating an adopted LCWIP and/or identified projects from the LCWIP into emerging Supplementary Planning Document/s (SPD) where it is able to support adopted Local Plan policies, but this will be required to go through public consultation stages. It is also recommended that this LCWIP will be updated periodically, to ensure that the identified projects are still relevant. This will enable the review of the relevant Local Plan policies to incorporate recommendations and/or projects contained within the most up to date LCWIP.

As important as building a route itself, is maintenance post construction. The value of an enhanced network of facilities is greatly reduced if the network is not maintained.

Arrangements for ongoing maintenance should be included when considering the design detail, e.g. materials used, extreme weather, landscaping.

Active travel corridors need special consideration in terms of ongoing maintenance. With sufficient funds this could include regular sweeping, surface repairs, gritting in cold weather, drain clearance and lighting repairs.

Monitoring and evaluating the benefits of investment in delivering the cycle network will be critical, and will enable organisations such as councils to make the case for future investment in the area. Monitoring will be carried out for individual schemes and the whole programme of network improvements.

## Chapter 7 – Bibliography

<https://www.sportengland.org/research/active-lives-survey>

<https://www.gov.uk/government/ /cycling-and-walking-investment-strategy>

<https://www.ashford.gov.uk/cycling-and-walking-consultation>

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/607016/cycling-walking-infrastructure-technical-guidance.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/607016/cycling-walking-infrastructure-technical-guidance.pdf)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/webtag-tag-unit-a5-1-active-mode-appraisal-may-2018>

<https://www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-and-policies/transport-and-highways-policies/active-travel-strategy>

[https://www.kent.gov.uk/ \\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0011/72668/Local-transport-plan-4.pdf](https://www.kent.gov.uk/ _data/assets/pdf_file/0011/72668/Local-transport-plan-4.pdf)

<https://www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-and-policies/environment-waste-and-planning-policies/countryside-policies-and-reports/public-rights-of-way-improvement-plan>

<https://wheelsforwellbeing.org.uk/survey-uks-disabled-cyclists/>

---