

## **Appendix 1 - The strategic assessment score**

The *strategic assessment score* is one of the pre-ranking calculations and is calculated by the following methodology:

<b>Category</b>	<i>(Maximum score)</i>
<b>Reallocation of road space</b>	<b>(20)</b>
<i>The scheme is a continuous route that:</i>	
20	<i>Reallocates road space in favour of cyclists along the majority of a main route</i>
10	<i>Reallocates road space in favour of cyclists in short sections, where road capacity allows (includes advanced stop lines, toucans or cycle parking in space previously available to cars)</i>
10	<i>Signing of quiet back street routes</i>
0	<i>Is broken and has many close sections of give ways (with little priority)</i>
<b>Personal safety</b>	<b>(20)</b>
<i>The scheme is:</i>	
20	<i>Well lit and unlikely to generate fear</i>
10	<i>Well lit in general although not completely open</i>
5	<i>Not lit however feeling of openness in daylight</i>
0	<i>Not lit, potentially secluded with no natural surveillance</i>
<b>Modal shift</b>	<b>(30)</b>
<i>The scheme aims to attract those making trips for either:</i>	
30	<i>Utility purposes (less than 5 miles from trip generator) and recreational purposes</i>
20	<i>Utility purposes (less than 5 miles from trip generator)</i>
5	<i>Recreational purposes</i>
<b>Real or perceived danger</b>	<b>(30)</b>
<i>The scheme is on a route where:</i>	
30	<i>Traffic volume reduction can be secured without increases in speed</i>
30	<i>Width of nearside lane &gt; 4 metres and speed limit ≤ 30mph</i>
30	<i>Route is developed for a Safer Route to School &amp;/or child/family/recreation/leisure use and is completely segregated from traffic</i>
20	<i>Traffic speed reductions can be secured</i>
15	<i>Speed or traffic reductions not possible but carriageway width allows segregation from traffic by painted line (standard width 1.2m – 1.5m mandatory and advisory cycle lanes – both ways)</i>
10	<i>Provides a less direct cycle route away from main traffic onto quieter roads</i>
5	<i>Signs an advisory route</i>
0	<i>Does not protect cyclists from heavy/fast traffic e.g. still perceived danger – pinch points</i>
<b>Integration with other routes</b>	<b>(40)</b>
<i>The scheme:</i>	
40	<i>Forms part of a wider transport network linking more than two major trip generators or public transport interchanges (including appropriate parking)</i>
35	<i>Links two major trip generators or public transport interchanges e.g. residential area to rail station (including appropriate parking)</i>
30	<i>Links trip generators but with high level of potential usage</i>
20	<i>Links trip generators but with low level of potential usage</i>
10	<i>Provides convenient route for local traffic with limited traffic</i>
0	<i>Is a stand alone short section scheme</i>

<b>Category</b>	<i>(Maximum score)</i>		
<i>score examples</i>			
<b>Social inclusion</b>	<b>(30)</b>		
<i>The scheme:</i>			
30	<i>Makes a cycle trip a viable alternative where previously there was no practical or safe route for all potential users</i>		
20	<i>Makes a cycle trip a viable alternative where previously there was no practical or safe route for most potential users e.g. children, disabled</i>		
0	<i>Has no real impact on reducing isolation for those without access to a private car</i>		
<b>Local community involvement</b>	<b>(20)</b>		
<i>From the list, how many of the below have shown willing support/identification of this route additionally to the Transport Planning Team and Parish Council:</i>			
<i>a) Councillors / b) Forums – Interest Groups / c) SRtS report / d) Public requests</i>			
5	<i>One of the above</i>		
10	<i>Two of the above</i>		
20	<i>Three or more of the above</i>		
<b>Promotion and publicity</b>	<b>(20)</b>		
<i>The scheme is likely to:</i>			
20	<i>Be nationally and locally marketed e.g. NCN route signed</i>		
15	<i>Have marketing / promotion integral to the scheme e.g. specifically designed route leaflet and signed as part of county network</i>		
10	<i>Be promoted through (eg) TravelWise with potential for route map e.g. with local signing</i>		
5	<i>Be promoted through usual (eg) Travelwise news articles, radio etc with local signing</i>		
0	<i>Have no real promotional aspect</i>		
<b>Partnership working</b>	<b>(20)</b>		
<i>The scheme:</i>			
20	<i>Involves partnership working and partnership funding e.g. Sustrans, Health Authority, British Waterways</i>		
10	<i>Involves partnership working with no funding</i>		
0	<i>None of the above</i>		
<b>Deliverability</b>	<b>(20)</b>		
20	<i>Council Owned Land, no consultation needed</i>		
10	<i>Council Owned Land, but consultation needed</i>		
5	<i>Privately Owned Land, negotiations needed</i>		
0	<i>Likely to require on going lengthy negotiations e.g. public footpath</i>		
<b>Cost per km</b>	<b>(30)</b>		
30	<i>&lt; £2000/km</i>	8	<i>£20001/km - £30000/km</i>
20	<i>£2000/km - £5000/km</i>	5	<i>£30001/km - £40000/km</i>
15	<i>£5001/km - £10000/km</i>	2	<i>£40000/km - £50000/km</i>
10	<i>£10001/km - £20000/km</i>	0	<i>&gt; £50000/km</i>

The maximum score of 280 is then converted to a percentage for final ranking.