

Planning methods - Methods for prioritising programmes to benefit pedestrians

PRIORITISATION BASED ON:	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
<p>Multi-criteria analysis: Prioritise highest rated schemes after scoring all schemes against different criteria/objectives. Criteria should reflect the objectives of the walking action plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows a true comparison across different criteria (Holistic approach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires enough information (data) about all criteria Scoring might be time-intensive
<p>Pedestrian numbers: Prioritise schemes on routes with existing high pedestrian use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that the greatest number of pedestrians will benefit from the treatment. Can be useful to identify high-profile schemes that help demonstrate a commitment to walking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to consider areas where flows are suppressed by hazards, physical difficulties or personal safety concerns. Difficulties in comparing pedestrian flows, due to their inherent variability.
<p>Trip linkage: Prioritise schemes on routes used for trips between the greatest number of origins and destinations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can mean that the greatest number of pedestrians benefit from the treatment. Can be useful to identify high-profile schemes that help demonstrate a commitment to walking. May reflect latent demand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not consider pedestrian numbers. Takes no account of whether there are actual or perceived problems.
<p>Barrier or gap removal: Prioritise schemes that remove physical obstacles on routes where the surrounding pedestrian facilities are of high quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates continuous routes. Straightforward to identify physical barriers. Especially effective in creating the core of the pedestrian network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to ascertain perceived barriers without considerable data.
<p>Proximity to major trip generator: Prioritise schemes that are geographically closest to a major trip origin or destination (e.g. school, supermarket)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May benefit the maximum number of pedestrians, as the likelihood of walking declines with increasing distance. May reflect latent demand. Trip origins and destinations are straightforward to identify. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not consider pedestrian numbers. Takes no account of whether there are actual or perceived problems.
<p>Supporting walking trips to a particular land use: Prioritise schemes in the vicinity of specific land uses e.g. schools, hospitals or aged care facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can have a positive effect on crash rates in the area(s) treated. The type of land use to be treated can easily be changed. Creates a high-quality environment for pedestrians, albeit in a limited area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disregards longer-distance routes between origins and destinations. May not support connected networks. May not identify the needs of other pedestrians in areas of different land uses.

PRIORITISATION BASED ON:	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
<p>Community need: Prioritise schemes that local people feel has the greatest need, determined through consultation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the potential to reflect latent demand. • Can be useful to publicly demonstrate a commitment to schemes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actual need may be different from perceived need. • Requires a consultation exercise. • Only reflects the views of those consulted.
<p>Crash savings: Prioritise schemes that generate the greatest potential crash cost savings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crash data is easily available. • Can result in cost-effective solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant under-reporting of pedestrian accidents means not all locations will be identified. • May not account fully for places that pedestrians may avoid because of poor safety perceptions.
<p>Easiest or cheapest to implement: Prioritise schemes that are the cheapest and/or easiest to implement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generates the maximum number of interventions on the ground. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not consider the perceived pedestrian need for schemes. • The cheapest and easiest solutions may not be the most cost effective or appropriate.
<p>Road classification or mode hierarchy: Schemes on roads that are higher in the road classification or on key routes for walking (the One Network Framework may assist).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that roads where pedestrians are especially vulnerable are treated. • May reflect latent demand. • Road classification is widely available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not consider pedestrian numbers or desire lines. • Takes no account of whether there are actual or perceived problems.
<p>Gaps in assets: Prioritise schemes where asset data shows gaps (e.g. missing kerb cutdowns)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quick and objective comparison criterion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires appropriate data to be either available or collected
<p>Demographics: Prioritise schemes in areas that have higher transport disadvantage, or proportion of people with disabilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is equitable • Can achieve major benefits in previously underserved areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local demographics on their own do not provide information on desire lines or specific locations within these areas: follow-up with street audit and local engagement to prioritise interventions