

Appendix C: Woodstock Area Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

Walking Audit Report
January 2025

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1 – WRAT scores for all routes. Colour coded..... | 3 |
| Red Routes..... | 4 |
| Orange Routes | 6 |
| Green Routes | 12 |

Figure 1 – WRAT scores for all routes. Colour coded.

| Route Number | WRAT Scores | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------|------------|--------|-----------|---------|
| | Attractiveness | Comfort | Directness | Safety | Coherence | Overall |
| 1 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 38 |
| 2 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 40 |
| 5 | 6 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 37 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 35 |
| 9 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 40 |
| 10 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 33 |
| 11 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 28 |
| 12 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 32 |
| 13 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 27 |
| 14 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 33 |
| 15 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 30 |
| 16 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 36 |
| 17 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 34 |
| 18 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 27 |
| 19 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 35 |
| 20 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 24 |
| 21 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 29 |
| 22 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 29 |
| 23 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 31 |
| 24 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 28 |
| 25 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 33 |
| 26 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 30 |
| 27 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 24 |
| 28 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 38 |
| 29 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 27 |
| 30 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 30 |
| 31 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 28 |
| 32 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 34 |
| 33 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 39 |
| 34 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 30 |
| 35 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 36 |
| 36 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 39 |
| 37 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 34 |
| 38 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 34 |
| 39 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 29 |
| 40 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 30 |
| 41 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 25 |
| 42 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 37 |
| 43 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 31 |
| 44 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 29 |
| 45 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 30 |
| 46 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 34 |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|----|----|---|---|----|
| 47 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 35 |
| 48 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 32 |
| 49 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 35 |
| 50 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 29 |
| 51 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 28 |
| 52 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 32 |
| 53 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 33 |
| 54 | 6 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 34 |
| 55 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 37 |
| 56 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 29 |
| 57 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 36 |
| 58 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 36 |
| 59 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 35 |

70% (a score of 28/40) should be regarded as a minimum level of provision.

| Red Routes | |
|--|---|
| Route 27 – Union Street | Score: 24 (2 red, 1 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Has one of the main car parks in Woodstock. Busy with cars from A44 to/from the car park.</p> <p>Road surface is cracked and there is no footway provision.</p> <p>Shared space with no guide, which makes it difficult for those less abled.</p> <p>Parking long road means people must deviate from desire line and wait for passing cars. Car focus rather than pedestrian.</p> <p>Steep at junction with Brook Hill.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurfacing of the road. • Ensure bench is well maintained so rest stop is available on the steep junction. • Consider making road access only to reduce rat running. • Consider designating as a shared space with signage and entry gateway features at both junctions |
| Route 20 – A44 Oxford Road | Score: 24 (1 red, 3 orange) |
| <p>Comments: Limited active frontage at sections towards the southeast; heavy traffic (incl HGV and bus); minor footway defects; pinch points on footway; limited existing crossing width; no crossing at Churchill Gate or Blenheim Palace bus stop; Blenheim Palace entrance difficult to navigate; and speeding vehicles.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repair defects and/or resurface • If possible, widen footway. • Extend width of pedestrian crossing • Consider crossing points at Churchill Gate and Blenheim Palace Bus Stop • Consider redesign of Blenheim Palace entrance to reduce width (while accommodating coaches) to improve pedestrian access. Consider raised table crossing and narrowing. |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| Route 41 – Green Lane NCN | Score: 25 |
| Comments: NCN Route 5. Lack of provision and signage. Isolated route. Full cycle lane provision may not be needed due to the low volume and speed of traffic but around the business area, some provision is needed. | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of vegetation. • Maintenance of road surface. Ponding at the side of the road. Cracking where cyclists and pedestrians would need to walk. • Warning signage for low visibility/sharp bend. • Consider increased lighting. The area covered by the business had lighting but limited elsewhere on the route. • Introduction of formalised footway/cycleway. Particularly around the business area. • This could include upgrade to the crossing points. |
| Route 13 – Cadogan Park/Princes Ride/Flemings Road | Score: 27 (1 red, 2 orange) |
| Comments: Overgrowth, areas with no passive surveillance, minor footway defects, pinch points, poor drainage, diversion from desire lines (footway and dropped kerbs), noise pollution, limited dropped kerb provision. | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trim vegetation • Repair / resurface footway • Improve/maintenance of drainage • Provide tactiles and improve dropped kerbs. Consider raised table junction at Cadogan Park junction (routes 13 and 18) |
| Route 18 – Cadogan Park | Score: 27 (1 red, 1 orange) |
| Comments: Uncleared leaf litter blocking path; limited active frontage; minor footway defects; narrow footways; parking concerns; major flooding concern; minor diversion from desire lines; and poor quality dropped kerbs with no tactiles. | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear leaf litter • Repair footway defects • Widen footway • Consider implementing a TRO to restrict parking issues. • Improve drainage at northernmost extent • Provide high quality dropped kerbs with tactiles • Provide raised table crossing at junction with (route 13) Cadogan Park. • Consider SUDs - investigate potential to provide drainage. |
| Route 29 – Banbury Road | Score: 27 (3 orange) |
| Comments: | Actions: |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Moderate traffic flow area but vehicles do not always adhere to speed limit particularly when entering Woodstock from Tackley. Some footway provision but in narrow and poor condition with cracking, pooling and uneven surface. On leaving Woodstock there is an informal car park where cars park across the footway resulting in pedestrians having to walk in the road. Further, there is no formal crossing along the route and the moderate traffic flow, makes crossing a challenge.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurface • Widen into verge where possible • Investigate who parks here and whether the footway can be extended into this area and benches added rather than it being an informal car park (continue footway into this area and stop people parking here) • Consider footway provision on southbound side to provide a connection to PRow 413/4/10, facilitated by new crossing near Budds Close that would also allow peds to access Budds Close • Build out/ raised table needed at junction with Hensington Road • Formal crossing needed in vicinity of Budds Close • Consider traffic calming/entryway feature north of Budds Close to slow traffic • Replace dropped kerbs |
| <p>Orange Routes</p> | |
| <p>Route 11 – Churchill Gate</p> | <p>Score: 28 (1 red, 2 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: No footway provision and fast incoming traffic which creates a potentially dangerous environment for pedestrians, particularly at the junction with A44 Oxford Road. Restricted visibility particularly at junctions and parking on roadside which pushes pedestrians into the middle of the main carriageway.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trim vegetation (particularly at A44 Oxford Road junction) • Resurface pavement of footway near A44 junction • Raised table layout • Resurface road surface with material to signal shared space between cars and pedestrians • Consider speed bumps near A44 junction • Formalise on-street parking bays and restrict the rest of the road with TROs • Dropped kerb with tactile paving from footway onto road (and / or raised table) • Install signage indicating shared use. |
| <p>Route 24 – Pathway between Recreation Road to Princes Ride (PRow 412/8/20)</p> | <p>Score: 28 (1 red, 2 orange)</p> |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Comments: Low hanging and overgrown trees and bushes which makes the route feel dark. No lighting and not overlooked which creates an unsafe feeling environment especially at nighttime. The surface is cracked, uneven and muddy with inconsistent widths due to overgrowing grass verge. Blocked drain at Recreation Road causing flooding and deviation from desire line. A direct known school route, request from school parents to surface the route as unusable during winter months when it becomes very muddy.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance – vegetation clearance • Resurface and widen route with all-weather surface • Drainage maintenance • Tactile paving • Lighting to make accessible at nighttime |
| <p>Route 31 – Shipton Road to Randolph Avenue</p> | <p>Score: 28 (3 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Volume and density of traffic increases at school drop off and pick up. Footway provision is limited and in poor condition with uneven, cracked surfaces that pool. Lack of crossing points that match desire lines when the pathway at the northern end stops.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurfacing needed. • Widen footway into the grass verge • Protect footway from vehicles driving on it – consider school zone approach e.g. pencils along kerb • Crossing point in the vicinity of Flemings Road • Jim Whiting lining strategy to implement lines and increase the places for cars to pull over to let a car in the opposite direction pass and so reduce speeding • Increase dropped kerbs and tactile paving – New Road and Flemings Road junctions in particular. |
| <p>Route 51 – A44 Oxford Street – Brook Hill to Rectory Lane Junction</p> | <p>Score: 28 (3 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Main road with bus stop and car parking provision which makes it a busy thoroughfare for pedestrians and traffic including HGVs. Inconsistent provision infrastructure with some maintenance issues. Hard to rectify as this is the main route to and from the Town Centre.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor maintenance – patching. • Varying paving types – resurface or match up as one type of paving. Slabs have trip hazards. • Tactile paving and dropped kerbs to be made consistent. |
| <p>Route 22 – New Road NCN5</p> | <p>Score: 29 (1 red, 2 orange)</p> |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Comments: Tree debris and some litter on a pathway. Bollards rather than barriers for the NCN shared space connecting to A44, which is more accessible. Cracked footway and some pooling on both sides of the road. Overgrown vegetation narrows the width of the footway in places which forces pedestrians into the road. Footpath ends abruptly on Community Centre side outside number 52. Some signage to indicate NCN route.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurface footway • Maintenance of vegetation • Raised table/continuous footway across side road to support people crossing <p>Dropped kerbs and tactile paving</p> |
| <p>Route 39 – Nature Reserve/ Budds Close Cut through</p> | <p>Score: 29 (1 red, 2 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Nature reserve path is narrow, uneven and overgrown with vegetation. There is no lighting and minimal surveillance at the entrance to and around the nature reserve. The wooden bollard at the entrance impacts accessibility and it is unclear where the path takes you or how long the route is both in distance and time. Some pooling on the surface at the entrance access.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance/vegetation clearance • Widen pathway into verge and create a formal all weather all year path • Remove wooden bollard at access gate to nature reserve to increase accessibility from Budds Close and cut back vegetation • Wayfinding along the path – include timings and distances • Dropped kerbs and tactiles at nature reserve entrance |
| <p>Route 50 – Watermeadows Nature Reserve</p> | <p>Score: 29 (1 red, 2 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Nature Reserve is difficult to assess as there is no formalised path but no traffic. Isolated and no lighting. Owned by Woodstock Town Council. Can flood when the River Glyme is high – marshy/boggy and not suitable for pushchairs/wheelchairs even though there is ramp access.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signage. • Check to see if WTC carry out any maintenance. |
| <p>Route 21 – Hensington Road</p> | <p>Score: 29 (3 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: West side is adjacent to car park and cemetery which is the favoured walking route due to the footway provision</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation clearance and maintenance • Replace benches |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>between the A44 and Shipton Road, more facilities and the greater width. Overgrown vegetation causing narrowing of the pathway in places. Benches are starting to rot, and pavements are cracking with minor potholes. Some ponding noticeable causing deviation from desire line of crossing at Kerwood Close. Benches are often in the middle of the grass verges with no path to them. No crossing points present.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pavement resurfacing – priority to West side • Indicate that the West side is prioritised for walking by signage • Road junction resurfacing at Kerwood Close • Formalise path to benches for accessibility • Crossing required in the vicinity of Banbury Road – consider raised table or a zebra crossing between Green Lane and Kerwood Close to support safer school and town centre journeys • Consider raised tables at all side road junctions including Union Street and Car park • Consider walking time signs and street art to support school journeys • Tactile paving |
| <p>Route 44 – A44 Manor Road</p> | <p>Score: 29 (3 orange)</p> |
| <p>Busy A road. Improvements to be made but provision is present. Pavements on either side have alternating widths and there is not consistency. Main route into/out of town centre including for buses.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of vegetation. • Maintenance of pathway where patching is evident. • Consider widening of pavements where possible – particularly where bus stops are present and when there is close proximity to traffic. • Tactile paving. |
| <p>Route 56 – Rectory Lane/Park Lane</p> | <p>Score: 29 (3 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Mainly residential but also used for rear access to business on Park Lane, which creates some confusion of the usage and safety. Limited pavement provision so lack of safe areas for pedestrians when HGVs for deliveries ect. Use the route. Confusion of the area is exacerbated due to isolated spots and no desire lines to main road and/or bus stops.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency of dropped kerbs and tactile paving. • Maintenance of pavements. • Repainting of yellow lines. • Consider formalisation of pedestrian walkway – perhaps with just white lines. • Consider more visible signage to warn pedestrians of HGV/delivery traffic. • Increased lighting especially in isolated areas. |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some evidence of anti-social behaviour – consider loitering deterrents. |
| Route 15 – Rye Grass/Plane Tree Way/Hensington Walk | Score: 30 (1 red, 1 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Plane Tree Way is a regular street with narrow provision that has defects and pooling and several pinch points</p> <p>Hensington Walk is pedestrian only, limited lighting</p> <p>Rye Grass was not possible to survey as it was under major construction and behind hoarding.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trim vegetation Install lighting on Hensington Walk Organise designated space for bins Resurface and widen Plane Tree Way footways Consider one-way system on Plane Tree Way Relocate lampposts in footways Formalise parking bays Install wayfinding at Hensington Walk entrance Implement TROs to stop cars parking on junction Improve dropped kerbs and install tactiles at Flemming Road junction. |
| Route 26 – Bear Close | Score: 30 (1 red, 1 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Some overgrown vegetation. Provision only on northbound side which has an uneven and cracked footpath. Very narrow and often easier to walk in the carriageway. Some pooling in footway including where it meets the road. Road is winding and where required to walk in the carriageway, visibility can become limited.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resurfacing required Due to narrow pathway, consider creating a shared space for pedestrians and cars. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving needed Consider a raised table at Hensington Road junction |
| Route 30 – Budds Close | Score: 30 (1 red, 1 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Cut through is hard to find. Residential area with footway parking and bins blocking driveways which results in varying footway widths further constrained.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of overgrown vegetation and moss on footway Consider a shared space to improve accessibility Consider parking recesses to mitigate footway parking Bins – is this an issue of community ownership? Wayfinding to cut through required |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropped kerbs and tactile paving required |
| Route 45 – Hill Rise | Score: 30 (3 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Route has 2 junctions onto the main A44 route in/out of Woodstock.</p> <p>Provision on A44 stops at Hill Rise junction – safety issues for crossing.</p> <p>Residential area with lack of lighting of all of route length.</p> <p>Vegetation overgrowth onto pavement which causes pedestrians to walk in carriageway – houses should maintain their own hedge.</p> <p>Bus shelter shows signs of misuse and neglect.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of bus stop – removal or upgraded. • Maintenance of vegetation – over pavement and lighting. • Maintenance of pathway – some patching. • Tactile paving needed. • Crossing point needed from A44 to Hill Rise. |
| Route 34 – Shipton Road to Colwells Road | Score: 30 (2 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Residential area with poor condition pavements. Uneven and cracked footway with some vegetation growth.</p> <p>Regular flow of traffic at higher speeds than expected.</p> <p>Lack of crossing of Banbury Road.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurfacing -particularly between Banbury Road and Hensington Close. • Vegetation clearance • Consider creating a school zone • Consider build outs or raised table crossing of Banbury Road • Jim Whiting – line strategy to implement lines and increase places for cars to give way to oncoming cars to reduce speed • Tactile paving and dropped kerbs around Marlborough School and between Primary School and Banbury Road crossing |
| Route 40 – Brook Hill | Score: 30 (2 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Footpath present cuts through to Bear close between 26b and 27 – narrow and muddy, vegetation maintenance, pathway maintenance/resurfacing, guard rails need replacing particularly bottom one.</p> <p>Only one side has pathway provision, not outside the houses but hedging side. Stops at Glyme Close.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactile paving • Increased lighting • Maintenance of pavement • Maintenance of guard rails • Cut through needs lighting and vegetation/pavement maintenance at minimum. <p>Consider replacing guard rails at the bottom, resurfacing to an even surface, handrails.</p> |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Noticeable ponding of pavement with some patching issues.</p> <p>Steps between Upper Brook Hill and Brook Hill limit the accessibility of the street. Those unable to use steps have to use the carriageway where there is no provision, and a low visibility give way junction.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider safer access options from Upper Brook Hill to Brook Hill. • Consider provision and crossing points from step access. • Consider crossing points |
| Green Routes | |
| Route 23 – Recreation Road | Score: 31 (2 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Moss on footpath and cracking. Blocked draining causing flooding and puddles. Very narrow. Footway finishes in a stone/mud mess opposite the youth centre.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance and resurfacing of the pathway • Consider the school side entry gate area to be turned into a school zone (e.g. signage/ features to show this is a school area) /school street access only (although do have youth centre car park). Consider the whole area as a shared space, or significantly widen pavement (currently wide highway is just encouraging school parents to park there) • Tactile paving |
| Route 43 – Upper Brook Hill | Score: 31 (2 oranges) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Reasonably well maintained with some street lighting, freshly painted yellow lines but some patching and areas of moss on pavement itself. Varying widths of provision on either side of the carriageway. Steps onto Brook Hill with no provision for cyclists or those who cannot use steps. Crossing point is on a slight diagonal which causes some visibility issues due to the location of the desire line.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased street lighting • Maintenance of pavement • Consider safer access options from Upper Brook Hill to Brook Hill • Maintenance of vegetation and consider a mirror at the crossing point to improve visibility further • Tactile paving |
| Route 52 – Browns Lane/Oxford Street/Angel Yard | Score: 32 (1 red, 1 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Well maintained residential area with permit parking only.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider whether provision is needed or if it is possible to surface the carriageway, so it is |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Shared use between vehicles and pedestrians means no provision, however there is a low volume of traffic. Some temporary obstructions with bins and parked cars. Closest desire line has steps, but alternative routes are available.</p> | <p>more obviously a shared use area.</p> |
| <p>Route 12 – NCN5 Oxford Road</p> | <p>Score: 32 (2 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Majority of footway is in good condition and well maintained. The short footway between NCR5 and A44 Oxford Road southeast of the Blenheim Palace bus stop is narrow and could be improved to accommodate disabled users of the footway.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install additional lighting where needed • Increase vegetation density to reduce noise pollution from A44 • Trim vegetation – particularly on footway between Blenheim Palace bus stop and NCR5 • Consider widening footways – especially footway between A44 and NCR5 at Blenheim Palace bus stop • Resurface - consider a more distinct/brighter material • Widen dropped kerbs and install tactile paving • Consider raised table crossing |
| <p>Route 48 – Westland Way</p> | <p>Score: 32 (2 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Overlooked and well-lit route. Some patching and pavement maintenance issues. Footway parking around the green space. Slightly sloped ramp to access the A44 with a Guard Rail present.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of pavement • Consider yellow lines around green space • Consider parking solutions – bays or inlets. • Tactile paving |
| <p>Route 14 – Flemings Road</p> | <p>Score: 33 (1 red, 1 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Overgrown vegetation with narrow footways and further pinch points where lampposts sit in the centre of the footway. Minor pavement defects. Several cars parked in driveways that enter the footway – widening footways would mitigate this impact. Layout somewhat confusing at Crecy Walk and A44.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trim vegetation • Pavement resurfacing • Widening of footway • Consider repositioning of lampposts • Provide signage at entrance of footpath. • Consider one-way system with Plane Tree Way |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Princes Ride/Flemings Road junction is difficult for pedestrians to cross.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider Modal filters at Princes Ride/Flemings Road junction • Dropped kerb improvements and tactile paving |
| <p>Route 53 – Harrison’s Lane/Chaucer’s Lane</p> | <p>Score: 33 (1 red)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Steps at the bottom of Brown’s Lane to A44 need maintenance. Overgrown vegetation, no entry sign is covered. Residential low traffic overlooked and well-lit area. Shared use between vehicles and pedestrians so no segregated provision.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of vegetation – particularly around signage. • Consider whether provision is needed or if it is possible to surface the carriageway/signage, so it is more obviously a shared use area |
| <p>Route 10 – Hedge End Shared Path</p> | <p>Score: 33 (1 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Majority of route is an exemplar shared footway/cycle. Northern connection to Hedge End: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unpaved and of poorer quality - unlit - narrower – not suitable for sharing Wayfinding is limited and layout is not clear – confusion over path being public or private garden</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a bin on Hedge End • Trim back vegetation to allow better view from surrounding houses for natural surveillance • Provide soft lighting towards the north of the pathway • Northern section to be surfaced and widened. • Consider painted lines throughout to split the pathway into cyclists and pedestrians • Install wayfinding signage for clarity |
| <p>Route 25 – Boundary Close</p> | <p>Score: 33 (1 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Berries from trees on path creating a slip hazard. Some pavement cracking, mainly on west side. Connection between Boundary Close and New Road felt like private land/could be private gardens. Some footway parking and bins blocking pathway. Footway provision covers west side of the road and only short sections on east side between Hensington Road and flats.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurface west side of the footway • Wayfinding/appropriate signage • Tactile paving |
| <p>Route 17 – Crecy Walk</p> | <p>Score: 34 (1 red)</p> |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Comments: Narrow footway constricted further by lampposts in the centre of the footway. Poor drainage and surfacing have resulted in water pooled on footway. Confusing access and no wayfinding at the footpath to A44/Hedge End.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactile paving • Implement wayfinding • Resurface • Consider better drainage solutions • Consider widening footway • Consider repositioning lampposts |
| <p>Route 38 – Lewisfield Way</p> | <p>Score: 34 (1 red)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Some vegetation and leaves on paving. Some cracking of paving slabs. Shared space between vehicles and pedestrians – unclear where or if there should be a pavement. No indication of coherence when joining another road or at the junction with Randolph Avenue.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small maintenance • Consider signage for clarity • Tactile paving • Consider raised table to define the shared space at junctions |
| <p>Route 32 – Hensington Close</p> | <p>Score: 34 (2 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Leaves, moss and weeds in pavement, which is also cracked and uneven, with some kerb erosion present. Incidents of parked cars which reduces widths and can cause walking in the carriageway. Bins and rubble/stones from cracked road cause temporary obstructions.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactile paving • Consider add wayfinding to town so that walking is encouraged • Resurface • Reinstate the kerb line • Maintenance of vegetation • Consider community engagement to stop footway parking. |
| <p>Route 37 – Orchard Walk</p> | <p>Score: 34 (2 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Apples from trees and leaves on footway No street lighting but houses provide surveillance and lighting. Closed to motorised traffic with signage to support this. Footway stops at fields – unclear where they lead (PRoW 342/2/10 and PRoW 342/3/10).</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactile paving where path joins road, shared space and PRoW. • Wayfinding to direct to PRoWs • Consider street lighting • Maintenance of leaves and apple fall – could this be community led? |
| <p>Route 46 – Vermont Drive/Rosamund Drive/Vanbrugh Close</p> | <p>Score: 34 (1 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments:</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More visible signage for the playground and PRoW access |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Rosamund Drive has access to Old Woodstock Playground which also leads to PRow to Wootton. Overlooked and well-lit residential area. Bus stop not in use on Vermont Drive. Some patching of the pavements.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of unused bus stop in Vermont Drive • Maintenance of overgrown hedges in Vanbrugh Close • Maintenance of pavement patching. • Tactile paving |
| <p>Route 54 – Pathway between Harrison’s Lane and A44 (SP4416)</p> | <p>Score: 34 (green)</p> |
| <p>Comments: OCC Highway maintained footpath SP4416. Attractive cut through with a heavy tree canopy and limited lighting. Steep and only steps – not accessible for cyclists/pedestrians with wheelchairs or push chairs as well as those with mobility issues. Potential for surface to become slippery when wet.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of hedges – could be owned by properties. • Consider soft/low lighting options • Consider handrail. |
| <p>Route 8 – Henrietta Way</p> | <p>Score: 35 (2 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Appears to be a work in progress - some sections of the route were not yet built, while other sections were unpaved. It is assumed that this will be fixed upon completion. Parking on footways that isn’t construction related.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install dropped kerb and tactile paving at 4 Axtell Crescent • Consider designated parking areas • It is assumed that the rest of the improvements will be implemented upon completion of construction - such as paving the footway. |
| <p>Route 47 – Marlborough Crescent/Mavor Close</p> | <p>Score: 35 (1 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: Marlborough Crescent has issues of overgrown hedges and moss on pavement. Pavements also have patching and maintenance issues. Recess parking.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of hedges and vegetation • Maintenance of pavement and patching • Tactile paving |
| <p>Route 49 – Farm End/St Andrews Square</p> | <p>Score: 35 (1 orange)</p> |
| <p>Comments: St Andrews Square is a private residence. Farm End is a cul-de-sac. Manor Road private residence has gate</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some maintenance issues including patching |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|---|
| access to a PRow footpath into eventually Blenheim Land - PRow 133/5/60. Narrow footway but low footfall and no through traffic. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street name sign could be updated • Tactile paving |
| Route 59 – Caroline Court | Score: 35 (1 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Maintenance of the area is poor in both vegetation and infrastructure areas. Mainly residential area with permit bay parking. Bins strewn across pavement and access point for service vehicles. Obscure guard rails. Tactile paving on one side of the crossing point.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance – moss on pavements and significant patching. • Tactile paving to be made consistent • Consider decluttering streetscape |
| Route 19 – Path to Woodstock Bowls and Tennis Club | Score: 35 (green) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Car free route. Limited active frontage for surveillance. No lighting with narrow footway at northernmost extent and heavy gates restrict accessibility.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide lighting – especially at the North end • Widen footway • Consider different options for the gate at play park so it can be more accessible but still child safe |
| Route 16 – Meadow Walk | Score: 36 (1 orange) |
| <p>Comments: Footway pavement has patching and some trenching. The pavement is also narrow with lamppost pinch points and no tactiles.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurface and repair footway • Widen footway • Consider repositioning lampposts • Consider implementing a one-way system • Install tactiles |
| Route 35 – Randolph Avenue | Score: 36 (1 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Some leaves and weeds in the paving slabs, of which some are cracked. Shared space between peds and traffic with footway provision between Lewisfield Way and junction with Shipton Road.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactile paving • Wayfinding – particularly at Shipton Road • Maintenance – vegetation and cracking |
| Route 57 – High Street | Score: 36 (1 orange) |
| Comments: | Actions: |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|---|--|
| Slow and infrequent traffic levels. Some maintenance issues. Businesses have outside seating and signage that has potential to reduce footway width. Parking bays available. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of paving • Tactile paving at crossing points • Some evidence of ponding |
| Route 58 – Market Place | Score: 36 (1 orange) |
| Comments: Maintenance issues. Presence of lighting, table and chairs, shop signage, parking pay machines and bollards. Parking bays available. | Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of paving • Some issues of cracking • Consider streetscape • Tactile paving |
| Route 42 – Glyme Close | Score: 37 (1 orange) |
| Comments: Access to the Watermeadows by garages. Driveway gates open into driveways not pavement. Slight pavement patching. | Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some maintenance of patching • Tactile paving • Consider better signage at the entrance to the Watermeadows • Consider directional signage to Watermeadows entrance. |
| Route 55 – Park Street | Score: 37 (1 orange) |
| Comments: Manned entrance into Blenheim Palace at the end of the street. Shopping and leisure street. Some trip hazards where slabs are coming up. Lots of street furniture. Attractive street with lighting, tree coverage and areas of cobbles. Parking bays available. | Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of slabs • Maintenance of cobbles • Tactile paving |
| Route 5 – Taylors Close | Score: 37 (green) |
| Comments: No footway provided: shared ped / car- but only serves three houses with no through road | Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider installing lighting (taking account of needs of residents) • Formalise parking bay and leave room in front of shared use footpath. |
| Route 28 – Ashford Close | Score: 38 (1 orange) |
| Comments: Residential area with an even shared space. Small section of wide footway at A44 junction. Some noise from A44. | Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactile paving |

Woodstock and Surrounding Areas Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Appendix C

| | |
|--|---|
| Many access points to/from surrounding amenities. Use of bollards rather than guardrails. | |
| Route 1 – Colwells Road | Score: 38 (green) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>NOTE: As some sections of the road were still under construction at the date surveyed - this WRAT has not assessed this road in its entirety.</p> <p>Uncleared leaf litter.</p> <p>Some instances of high speeds near the nursery with cars coming from Shipton Lane junction.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore traffic calming at Shipton Lane junction – Chicanes/cyclist friendly speed bumps. |
| Route 36 – Blackberry Way | Score: 39 (1 orange) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Wide even surfaced footway around the playground before joining a shared space.</p> <p>Raised table/different surface at junction between side roads and main roads.</p> <p>Clear sightlines.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactile paving |
| Route 33 – Sansoms Court | Score: 39 (green) |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Shared space.</p> <p>Weeds in paving slabs but does not impact ability to walk.</p> | <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation maintenance |
| Route 2 – Rose Drive | Score: 40 |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Exemplar new build route with provision for walking.</p> <p>Some sections are shared between cars, pedestrians and cyclists - but with adequate measures / no through route so that this will not likely present a safety issue.</p> | <p>Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobility hub • Visitor cycle parking • EV guest charging |
| Route 9 – Wheeler Avenue | Score: 40 |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>Exemplar walking infrastructure.</p> | <p>Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobility hub • Visitor cycle parking • EV guest charging |