

Appendix 3a: Multi-Criteria Assessment Framework (MCAF)- Cycling network

Table 3. MCAF results for the cycling network (Phases 1 and 2)

ID		Rating Rules →	Wei	Max Score	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	15	16	17	18	19
	Name/Description				Guildford High and North Streets	Guildford Park to Town Centre	Stoke Road to Town Centre	High St A3100	Town Centre to University of Surrey	Station Access Quietway	Westborough and Park Barn to Sports Grounds	Rydes Hill Rd-Shepherds Ln-Stoughton Rd	A3 Bypass route	Guildford College to Woking	Southway	Western Spoke - Aldershot Rd A322	Worplesdon Road	Worplesdon to Normandy	Ash to Normandy	Ash Street	Ash - Vale Road
	(km)				1.72	2.90	1.79	1.89	1.12	1.81	3.52	2.44	3.32	4.81	2.32	3.51	3.07	5.13	2.71	3.66	3.21
Access	CWZs Served by Corridor (within 400m)	1: < 2 2: < 4 3: ≥ 4	2	3	2	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	2
	Rail Station Access (within 400m)	Station Nos. Score: 0: No Station 2: 1 RS within 400m 3: 2 RS within 400m	3	3	2	2	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	3
	Number of Schools (within 400m)	1: < 1 2: < 2.5 3: ≥ 2.5	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	3	1
	Weighted Score %		30%	100%	79%	75%	100%	33%	54%	100%	50%	50%	50%	88%	38%	50%	38%	33%	46%	79%	67%
Demand	Development Sites (No of Dwellings within 400m)	1: < 25 2: < 500 3: ≥ 500	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	3	0
	School PCT (Go Dutch, Number of daily School Trips)	1: < 100 2: < 250 3: ≥ 250	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	1	1	3	2
	PCT Tool (eBike, Number of Daily Commuters)	1: < 600 2: < 1200 3: ≥ 1200	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
	Weighted Score %		30%	100%	78%	78%	89%	67%	67%	78%	89%	44%	67%	89%	78%	56%	44%	22%	44%	78%	33%
Cycle Network	Contributes to Improved Cycling Network (Number of Links to Other Segments of Proposed LCWIP Network)	1: < 0.75 2: < 1.5 3: ≥ 1.5	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1
	Contributes to Improved Cycling Network (Existing Cycle Facilities i.e., Cycle Tracks, Bridleways & Greenways)	1: < 0.05 2: < 0 3: ≥ 0	1	3	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3
	Pedal Cycle Collision History (Cycle Collisions per KM)	1: < 1 2: < 2 3: ≥ 2	3	3	3	3	3	2	0	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	0	3	2
	Weighted Score %		15%	100%	100%	87%	93%	80%	33%	93%	67%	93%	87%	93%	67%	93%	100%	60%	27%	87%	67%
Deliverability	Ease of Implementation	1: Likely Major Constraints, such as Limited Public Highway, Bridges, Steep Gradient 2: Significant Constraints, Narrow Country Lanes with no Significant Traffic Flows 3: Use of Footpaths, Bridleways & Sections of Country Lanes with No Traffic	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	2
	Weighted Score %		5%	100%	33%	67%	33%	67%	33%	67%	33%	67%	100%	67%	100%	67%	100%	67%	67%	33%	67%
	Comments (Comments & Agreements per KM)	1: < 5 2: < 50 3: ≥ 50	2	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	1
Stakeholder Input	Stakeholder Feedback - Workshop (number of Stakeholder Votes)	1: < 5 2: < 9 3: ≥ 9	2	3	3	2	3	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Weighted Score %		20%	100%	100%	83%	100%	50%	33%	50%	17%	50%	83%	83%	50%	67%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%
	Weighted Route Score %		-	100%	84%	79%	92%	55%	50%	81%	57%	56%	70%	87%	60%	62%	51%	36%	41%	68%	50%
	Rank		-	-	3	7	1	18	27	5	16	17	8	2	14	12	25	30	28	9	36
	Network Priority		-	-	High	High	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Med	High	High	Med	Med	Low	Low	Low	High	Low

ID		Rating Rules -->		Weight	Max Score	20	21	22	23	25	26	27	28	29	30	47	61	62	68
Name/Description						Ash - Manor Road	Peasmarsh to Shatford	Jacobs Well Rd-Clay Ln	Southern Spoke - Guildford to Godalming	West Clandon to Send	The Mount	Eastern Spoke - Epsom Road	Epsom Road East	East Horsley Link	Northeastern Spoke	Shalford to Chilworth	Ripley to Cobham	Clay Lane and Worplesdon path	Christmas Pie Trail
(km)						4.22	5.40	3.18	3.39	7.18	6.71	2.92	10.90	4.97	7.67	3.70	6.86	2.48	10.41
Access	CWZs Served by Corridor (within 400m)	1: < 2 2: < 4 3: ≥ 4	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	1	3
	Rail Station Access (within 400m)	Station Nos. Score: 0: No Station 2: 1 RS within 400m 3: 2 RS within 400m	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3	0	3	0	0	2
	Number of Schools (within 400m)	1: < 1 2: < 2.5 3: ≥ 2.5	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	0	1	1	1	1	0	2
	Weighted Score %		30%	100%	<div><div></div></div> 54%	<div><div></div></div> 75%	<div><div></div></div> 29%	<div><div></div></div> 42%	<div><div></div></div> 54%	<div><div></div></div> 50%	<div><div></div></div> 79%	<div><div></div></div> 63%	<div><div></div></div> 54%	<div><div></div></div> 29%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 21%	<div><div></div></div> 8%	<div><div></div></div> 75%	
Demand	Development Sites (No of Dwellings within 400m)	1: < 25 2: < 500 3: ≥ 500	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	3	0	3
	School PCT (Go Dutch, Number of daily School Trips)	1: < 100 2: < 250 3: ≥ 250	2	3	3	1	3	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2
	PCT Tool (eBike, Number of Daily Commuters)	1: < 600 2: < 1200 3: ≥ 1200	2	3	1	3	2	3	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
	Weighted Score %		30%	100%	<div><div></div></div> 78%	<div><div></div></div> 78%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 78%	<div><div></div></div> 56%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 78%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 44%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 56%	<div><div></div></div> 56%	<div><div></div></div> 33%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	
Cycle Network	Contributes to Improved Cycling Network (Number of Links to Other Segments of Proposed LCWIP Network)	1: < 0.75 2: < 1.5 3: ≥ 1.5	1	3	1	3	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
	Contributes to Improved Cycling Network (Existing Cycle Facilities i.e., Cycle Tracks, Bridleways & Greenways)	1: < 0.05 2: < 0 3: ≥ 0	1	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	1	2	1
	Pedal Cycle Collision History (Cycle Collisions per KM)	1: < 1 2: < 2 3: ≥ 2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	0
	Weighted Score %		15%	100%	<div><div></div></div> 80%	<div><div></div></div> 87%	<div><div></div></div> 60%	<div><div></div></div> 87%	<div><div></div></div> 60%	<div><div></div></div> 53%	<div><div></div></div> 93%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 73%	<div><div></div></div> 73%	<div><div></div></div> 53%	<div><div></div></div> 87%	<div><div></div></div> 13%	
Deliverability	Ease of Implementation	1: Likely Major Constraints, such as Limited Public Highway, Bridges, Steep Gradient 2: Significant Constraints, Narrow Country Lanes with no Significant Traffic Flows 3: Use of Footpaths, Bridleways & Sections of Country Lanes with No Traffic	1	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3
	Weighted Score %		5%	100%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 100%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 33%	<div><div></div></div> 100%	<div><div></div></div> 100%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 100%	<div><div></div></div> 100%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 100%	
	Comments (Comments & Agreements per KM)	1: < 5 2: < 50 3: ≥ 50	2	3	1	3	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1
Stakeholder Input	Stakeholder Feedback - Workshop (number of Stakeholder Votes)	1: < 5 2: < 9 3: ≥ 9	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	0
	Weighted Score %		20%	100%	<div><div></div></div> 33%	<div><div></div></div> 83%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 33%	<div><div></div></div> 50%	<div><div></div></div> 83%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 50%	<div><div></div></div> 50%	<div><div></div></div> 33%	<div><div></div></div> 33%	<div><div></div></div> 33%	<div><div></div></div> 17%	
	Weighted Route Score %		-	100%	<div><div></div></div> 62%	<div><div></div></div> 81%	<div><div></div></div> 54%	<div><div></div></div> 66%	<div><div></div></div> 52%	<div><div></div></div> 55%	<div><div></div></div> 83%	<div><div></div></div> 67%	<div><div></div></div> 53%	<div><div></div></div> 55%	<div><div></div></div> 59%	<div><div></div></div> 41%	<div><div></div></div> 36%	<div><div></div></div> 53%	
	Rank		-	-	13	6	21	11	24	20	4	10	22	19	15	29	31	23	
	Network Priority		-	-	Med	High	Med	High	Low	Med	High	High	Low	Med	Med	Low	Low	Low	



Appendix 3b: Multi-Criteria Assessment Framework (MCAF)- Core Walking Zones

Table 4. MCAF results for the CWZ (Phases 1 and 2)

ID	Rating Rules -->	Weight	Max Sc	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
CWZ Name/Description				Guildford	Guildford Park	Woodbridge Hill	Stoke	Worplesdon Road, Stoughton	Stoughton Road, Bellfields	Park Barn	Aldershot Road	Grange Road, Stoughton	University of Surrey	Tongham	Ash
Area				Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Guildford urban area	Ash & Tongham urban area	Ash & Tongham urban area
Access	Other Key Destinations (Retail areas, parks, Hospitals; within 10min walk)	1: < 4 2: < 12 3: ≥ 12	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2
	Number of Schools (within 10min walk)	1: < 2 2: < 4 3: ≥ 4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
	Bus Stops (# of stops) (within 10min walk)	1: < 15 2: < 30 3: ≥ 30	1	3	3	3	1	3	2	2	3	3	3	1	1
	Rail Station Access (within 10min walk)	Station Nos. Score: 0: No Station 1: 1 RS within 10 min walk 2: 1 RS within CWZ 3: 2 RS within CWZ	3	3	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	CWZ Weighted Score %		30%	100%	100%	78%	67%	70%	67%	56%	56%	67%	67%	78%	52%
Demand	Development Sites (No of Dwellings within 10min Walk)	1: < 25 2: < 500 3: ≥ 500	2	3	3	3	0	2	0	0	3	0	3	2	0
	Total Population (within 10min walk)	1: < 3500 2: < 7000 3: ≥ 7000	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	1	2	3	3	1	2
	Total Workplace Population (within 10min walk)	1: < 400 2: < 2000 3: ≥ 2000	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2
	CWZ Weighted Score %		30%	100%	100%	88%	75%	79%	63%	38%	88%	75%	63%	100%	54%
Existing Pedestrian Quality	Posted Speed (Highest Speed within CWZ)	1: ≤ 20 2: = 30 3: > 30	1	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Traffic Flows (Highest Flows within CWZ)	1: < 5001 2: ≤ 10000 3: > 10000	1	3	3	1	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	2	3
	Pedestrian Collision History (within CWZ)	1: < 1 2: < 2 3: ≥ 2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	3
	CWZ Weighted Score %		15%	100%	92%	75%	83%	92%	75%	75%	67%	92%	83%	58%	50%
Deliverability	Potential to Improve to a High & Accessible Standard, relative to Existing Condition (along Main CWZ Corridor only)	1: Lower Potential 2: Medium Potential 3: Higher Potential	1	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	2
	Significant Constraints or Dependencies (along main CWZ corridor only)	1: Significant Constraints (e.g. land take, third party works) 2: Constraints Typical for a Transport Improvement 3: Limited Constraints	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	2
	CWZ Weighted Score %		5%	100%	50%	50%	67%	67%	67%	67%	83%	100%	67%	50%	67%
Stakeholder Input	Commonplace Comments (within CWZ)	1: < 5 2: < 10 3: ≥ 10	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	1	0
	Stakeholder Feedback - Workshop (number of Stakeholder Votes)	1: < 2 2: < 5 3: ≥ 5	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
	CWZ Weighted Score %		20%	100%	100%	100%	87%	67%	80%	80%	60%	100%	87%	100%	47%
Weighted CWZ Score %		-	#####	96.25%	83.33%	75.67%	75.28%	69.33%	58.50%	69.08%	81.25%	71.92%	84.58%	51.97%	52.14%
Rank		-	-	1	3	5	6	8	11	9	4	7	2	14	13
Network Priority		-	-	High	High	High	High	Med	Med	Med	High	High	High	Med	Med



ID	Rating Rules -->	Weight	Max Sc	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
CWZ Name/Description				Ash Vale	Ash Station	Shalford	Effingham	Send	Station Parade, East Horsey	Fairlands	Effingham Junction Station	Gomshall
Area				Ash & Tongham urban area	Ash & Tongham urban area	Rural area	Rural area	Rural area	Rural area	Rural area	Rural area	Rural area
Access	Other Key Destinations (Retail areas, parks, Hospitals; within 10min walk)	1: < 4 2: < 12 3: ≥ 12	2	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
	Number of Schools (within 10min walk)	1: < 2 2: < 4 3: ≥ 4	3	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1
	Bus Stops (# of stops) (within 10min walk)	1: < 15 2: < 30 3: ≥ 30	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
	Rail Station Access (within 10min walk)	Station Nos. Score: 0: No Station 1: 1 RS within 10 min walk 2: 1 RS within CWZ 3: 2 RS within CWZ	3	3	3	2	2	0	0	2	0	2
	CWZ Weighted Score %		30%	100%	67%	59%	63%	44%	30%	59%	33%	44%
Demand	Development Sites (No of Dwellings within 10min Walk)	1: < 25 2: < 500 3: ≥ 500	2	3	0	2	1	2	2	2	0	0
	Total Population (within 10min walk)	1: < 3500 2: < 7000 3: ≥ 7000	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Total Workplace Population (within 10min walk)	1: < 400 2: < 2000 3: ≥ 2000	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
	CWZ Weighted Score %		30%	100%	38%	42%	46%	54%	42%	42%	25%	25%
Existing Pedestrian Quality	Posted Speed (Highest Speed within CWZ)	1: ≤ 20 2: = 30 3: > 30	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
	Traffic Flows (Highest Flows within CWZ)	1: < 5001 2: ≤ 10000 3: > 10000	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3
	Pedestrian Collision History (within CWZ)	1: < 1 2: < 2 3: ≥ 2	2	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1
	CWZ Weighted Score %		15%	100%	75%	58%	75%	75%	92%	50%	75%	92%
Deliverability	Potential to Improve to a High & Accessible Standard, relative to Existing Condition (along Main CWZ Corridor only)	1: Lower Potential 2: Medium Potential 3: Higher Potential	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3
	Significant Constraints or Dependencies (along main CWZ corridor only)	1: Significant Constraints (e.g. land take, third party works) 2: Constraints Typical for a Transport Improvement 3: Limited Constraints	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1
	CWZ Weighted Score %		5%	100%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%
Stakeholder Input	Commonplace Comments (within CWZ)	1: < 5 2: < 10 3: ≥ 10	3	3	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0
	Stakeholder Feedback - Workshop (number of Stakeholder Votes)	1: < 2 2: < 5 3: ≥ 5	2	3	1	3	2	2	2	0	2	2
	CWZ Weighted Score %		20%	100%	13%	60%	67%	27%	47%	27%	0%	47%
Weighted CWZ Score %		-	#####	48.50%	54.36%	60.56%	49.50%	47.81%	46.44%	32.08%	47.25%	38.25%
Rank		-	-	16	12	10	15	17	19	21	18	20
Network Priority		-	-	Low	Med	Med	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

