Appendix M: Example prioritisation process

Scheme prioritisation process

The scoring matrix included below has been developed from the approach used by Bridgend County Borough Council during the prioritisation of its Local Transport Plan proposals. It was originally adapted from a matrix developed by Local Transport Projects Limited as part of their work when on the Cardiff Strategic Cycle Network Plan. The tool was also used previously by the erstwhile Sewta Active Travel group as the basis for its RTP active travel scheme prioritisation process.

The matrix contains 26 separate scoring elements, related to the benefits and accessibility improvements which it is anticipated that schemes will deliver. It is intended that the matrix will provide a mechanism to assist local authorities to identify which schemes are likely to have the greatest impact, and therefore should be prioritised for development and delivery.

When scoring the schemes, the route should be assessed in terms of its potential to cater for a whole journey, particularly in terms of linking to services and facilities. Details of the criteria that should be used as the basis for scoring each element of the matrix are included in the tables below.

Table M1: Example Prioritisation Factors Matrix

Proposal		Cost	Cost	Accident and Speed data on existing route or alternative highway route				Access to Facilities (0 to +2)									Benefits to pedestrians (-2 to +2)					Benefits to cyclists (-2 to +2)					Wider benefits			Risks to delivery (-2 to +2)				Delivery						
Scheme name and location		Estimated scheme cost (£,000)	Match funding element (£,000)	Pedestrian and cyclist accidents within the last 3 years	Target traffic speed	Actual traffic speeds	Speed above target	Education	Employment	Shops/Retail/PO	Leisure facility/Tourist attraction	Community Centre/Church	Health facility (Doctor/Dentist)	Transport interchange	Enterprise/Local Growth Zone	WIMD Access to services score	Convenience	Accessibility	Safety	Comfort	Attractiveness	Convenience	Accessibility	Safety	Comfort	Attractiveness	Potential to induce modal shift	Impact on Health	Impact on other road users	Enviromental issues	Land Issues	Planning consent	Consultation	Current Stage Gate	Stage Gate (at end of FY of bid)	Can scheme be delivered in phases? (Y/N)	Facilities score	Benefit score	Risk to Delivery score	TOTAL SCORE
Location	Brief description			Total no		85% speeds																																	
																																			0	0	0	0
																																			0	0	0	0
																																			0	0	0	0
																																			0	0	0	0

Table M2: Example Prioritisation Scoring Matrix

	Access to Facilities			Risks to Delivery			
	Access to Education, Employment and key services (each type scored separately on assessment form)	**Access to major transport interchanges (bus/train stations)**	**Population affected by route proposals**	**Environmental/ Ecology Issues**	**Land Issues**	**Planning Consent**	**Consultation**
2	Route provides a continuous link to trip attractors within 400m of route.	Route provides a continuous link to public transport interchanges within 400m of route.	'x' population within 200m of the route proposals	No environmental/ ecological issues or issues resolved.	No land issues or land in ownership of local authority.	Planning consent not required or planning consent granted with no conditions.	Consultation and engagement completed.
1	Route provides a continuous link to trip attractors within 800m of route.	Route provides a continuous link to trip attractors within 800m of route.	'x' population within 400m of the route proposals	Environmental issues identified and resolution programmed/ arranged	Land owned by 3rd party but lease/other arrangements in place.	Planning consent granted but with conditions.	Consultation required and programmed. Scheme unlikely to be contentious.
0	Route provides a continuous link to trip attractors more than 800m away from route.	Route provides a continuous link to trip attractors more than 800m away from route.	'x' population within 800m of the route proposals	Environmental/ ecological issues identified	Scheme requires 3rd party land and landowner identified and discussions ongoing	Planning consent required – planning application submitted.	Consultation required and programmed but scheme likely to be contentious **or** not programmed and unlikely to be contentious.
-1	Unlikely to occur in practice.	Unlikely to occur in practice.	Unlikely to occur in practice	Environmental/ ecological issues unknown	3rd party land required and landowner identified but no contact established.	Planning consent required – no application submitted.	Consultation required and not programmed. Scheme likely to be contentious.
-2	Unlikely to occur in practice.	Unlikely to occur in practice.	Unlikely to occur in practice	n/a	Scheme requires 3rd party land but landowner unknown.	Planning consent rejected.	n/a

Table M3: Example Benefits Scoring System

	Convenience	Accessibility	Safety	Comfort	Attractiveness	Impact on other road users			Potential to induce modal shift
2	• Route is direct for journeys for which it is expected to cater • Route is essentially level • Route contains few points of delay and/or avoids existing delays	Provides significantly improved link - • along identified desire line • to key trip generator(s) • between two existing links • across existing severance Proposal also readily accessible from all streets and premises	Addresses significant recorded collision history (4 in 3 yrs, or 2 KSI in 3 yrs suggested)	Significantly improves comfort (i.e. provides complete segregation from traffic with buffer, a well overlooked route, minimal traffic speeds etc.)	Proposals significantly improve the environment for cycling /pedestrians in terms of aesthetics, noise, and quality of public space	Unlikely to occur in practice		**5**	Likely to result in significant modal shift from private car to pedal cycle/foot either as a result of the physical connection **or** route being *within* an area benefitting from an on-going behaviour change programme e.g. Smarter Choices/Bike It
1	• Route reasonably direct for journeys for which it is expected to cater • Route includes only moderate gradients • Route contains some points of delay and/or reduces existing delays	Provides improved links - • along identified desire line • to key trip generator(s) • between two existing links • across existing severance May also improve slightly accessibility to other streets and premises	Addresses lesser recorded collision history, or location understood to have a collision history which is not fully recorded	Improves comfort (i.e. provides some segregation from traffic, traffic speeds below 20mph without segregation, personal safety improvements such as CCTV and lighting etc.)	Proposals slightly improve the environment for cycling/walking in terms of aesthetics, noise, and quality of public space	Provides some additional benefit to other road users on balance (as a toucan might for pedestrians)		**3**	May increase numbers of cyclists/pedestrians but unlikely to result in significant modal shift from private cars either as a result of physical works **or** the route *connecting to* an area benefitting from a behaviour change programme
0	• Proposals do not offer greater convenience	Proposals do not improve accessibility	No expected impact on collisions	No expected improvement in terms of comfort	Proposals have little or no benefit on quality of environment for	No significant expected impact for other road users		**0**	Little or no modal shift expected and scheme not linked to behaviour change programme

	than existing situation				cycling/walking in terms of aesthetics, noise, and quality of public space				
-1	• Proposal requires less direct route than existing • Route introduces points of delay	Unlikely to occur in practice	Proposals may result in additional collisions	May reduce level of comfort for cyclists/pedestrians	Proposals degrade quality of environment for cycling/walking in terms of aesthetics, noise, and quality of public space	Some significant negative impact expected for other road users (i.e. loss of residential parking, some additional congestion		**-1**	Unlikely to occur in practice
-2	Unlikely to occur in practice	Unlikely to occur in practice	Unlikely to occur in practice	Unlikely to occur in practice	Unlikely to occur in practice	Very significant negative impact expected for other road users (i.e. serious congestion, especially for PT, loss of parking in retail areas, restrictions on loading		**-2**	Unlikely to occur in practice