

Kent Active Travel Feasibility Study – Consultant Brief Template

1. Project Title

Faversham LCWIP Walking Route 10 Bysing Wood/West Faversham Area

2. Commissioning Authority

District/Borough Council: Swale Borough Council

Lead Officer: Michelle Anderson (SBC) working in collaboration with Kent County Council Active Travel Team and Faversham Town Council Active Travel Committee

Contact Details:

Michelle Anderson, Swale Borough Council, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT. Tel 01795 417335 Email: michelleanderson@swale.gov.uk

Rob Gibbs, Faversham Town Council, 12 Market Place, Faversham, ME13 7AE. Tel 01795 503286 Email: rob.gibbs@favershamtowncouncil.gov.uk

3. Background & Context

Background Summary:

This commission is funded from the Kent County Council Department for Transport Local Transport Grant allocation. This is a post Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan implementation project, exploring the realities of delivering the part of Walking Route 10 which runs through West Faversham and parts of the neighbouring walking routes 4 and 6 which also run through the area as identified in the Faversham LCWIP.

Link to latest version Faversham LCWIP: <https://favershamtowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Faversham-LCWIP-Aug-25.pdf>

3.1 Route Objectives

The objectives of developing these routes are:

- To improve active travel links within this area and beyond, to key local facilities like schools, the local community centre, the local superstore, the local country park and also to Faversham Town Centre and Faversham Railway Station.
- To contribute to the further slowing of traffic and improved safety for walking, wheeling and cycling, which has resulted from the AT2 funded Town Wide 20mph scheme.
- To further develop the safe accessible town wide walking network that has started to be developed through the AT4 funded East West Walking Route and the soon to be constructed AT5 funded North South Walking Route interventions.

4. Aim of the Feasibility Study

The Feasibility Study is the start of a potential chain of projects to enable the construction of some of this proposed infrastructure. The aim is to technically understand what elements of these routes are deliverable and to gauge stakeholder and resident support. The proposals may include traffic management as well as physical interventions. If suggested interventions prove feasible, then this work may be continued into development and ultimately construction by KCC at the appropriate time.

We are particularly concerned to identify what residents feel their active travel needs are and how these can be most effectively met so that residents feel that interventions are relevant and helpful. We want to make sure any future public investment in this area is aligned with the challenges that local people face and will be seen as tackling real problems. So, we want to generate a high level of public engagement and make sure improvements proposed are along heavily used walking routes.

This commission aims to move this project from the Faversham LCWIP to Feasibility. This will include the following activities:

- Initial residents and stakeholder engagement via established local stakeholders, including experiential sessions with residents.
 - Technical
 - Local
 - Experiential Sessions
- Development of a Risk Register identifying risks to development and implementation.
- Audit of relevant walking route corridors using the ATE Route Checker
- Identification of potential crossing points and other interventions, drawing on resident feedback and technical assessment of East West Walking route interventions in similar locations and using the ATE Crossing Selector
- Outline Drawings of most deliverable proposals
- Visualisations for use in public engagement events.

If resources allow we also want to carry out Utility Surveys at planned intervention locations, develop a Wayfinding Strategy and assess costs and likely value for money using the ATE Active Mode Appraisal Toolkit.

5. Scope of Work

5.1 LCWIP & 10-Year Plan Analysis

As part of the desk work for this study the Faversham LCWIP is to be reviewed along with the detailing of the Active Travel 10 Year Plan Prioritisation Score for this route - so why this route has a particular score against each sub-criteria. This information and data begin to build a business case. The Faversham LCWIP identifies a number of problems with these

corridors including narrow pavements, wide side junction entries and severance issues caused by the railway line and the A2 Watling Street. The Ten Year Plan Analysis including criteria scores is supplied as an appendix.

5.2 Policy Review

Key documents to be reviewed are the **Faversham Neighbourhood Plan** which has a key objective of promoting active travel and includes a Critical Junctions study; the developing **Swale Local Plan** which goes to Section 19 consultation during Autumn 2026; the **Kent LCWIP** which includes a proposed route to Sittingbourne which would go along the edge of the project area; The Swale LCWIP which includes cycling routes to Ashford and Sittingbourne which go through the project area and the **Town to Parishes Project Report** which is an appendix to the Faversham LCWIP identifying routes through the project area.

5.3 Local Context

For the purposes of this project the West Faversham area has been defined as the area bounded by the B2045 Western Link, Bysing Wood Road down to the southern entrance to Wildish Road, Wildish Road to the turn off to the footpath running through to Hazebrouck Road, Hazebrouck Road, Judd Road to alleyway running through to Lower Road, Lower Road to the entrance to Lionfield, Lionfield to the footpath running through to Ospringle Road, Ospringle Road to junction with A2 Ospringle Street, A2 Ospringle Street(including Water Lane upto Ospringle primary school) up to junction with B2045 Western Link. This whole area is shown on the map supplied. This area covers almost all of the social housing within West Faversham

West Faversham, which route 10 goes through, is an area with high levels of social deprivation and exclusion. It is more than 20 minutes' walk to the town centre and most services, surrounded by two major roads carrying lorry traffic and bus services have declined in the last few years. A number of new estates have been built up against the Western Link in the last 5 years which are not linked to the road network of the rest of the area and which could benefit from better active travel links. It will be important that any public investment here is aligned with the challenges that local people face and can be seen to be tackling real problems, so we would want it to be driven by adequate consultation and to make improvements to routes that residents use on a regular basis, even if they are off the direct line of Route 10. An example is the route to Ospringle School from Lower Road which involves navigating the A2 and some narrow pavements and streets which are not included in the 20mph scheme.

This neighbouring Ospringle Street/ Water Lane area is currently outside the town-wide 20mph zone, the A2 running through the middle of it forming the boundary. There is public support for interventions in the area. It has seen multiple road traffic accidents in recent years and is on the designated freight route between distribution centres close to the

Western Link and the M2 motorway junctions to the east. The area has many similarities to the section of Route 10 in the Bysing Wood area being put forward, in that both are areas of deprivation, with access to local services in Faversham Town centre being a good 20-minute walk away. The area has seen significant cuts to bus services in recent years. The area includes a primary school and has narrow streets and pavements. There is one crossing of the A2, a light-controlled crossing and it has multiple small junctions with limited visibility.

The Bysing Wood Road area has deprivation score of 6052, Ospringe |Street/Water Lane has a deprivation score of 6269 (both in same deprivation band)

The only relevant new project that we are aware of currently is Swale Borough Council's recently completed improvements to a pedestrian path linking Whiting Crescent and Wildish Road using Pride in Place Impact funding.

5.3 Site Assessment & Data Collection

The Consultants are expected to undertake site visits to fully understand the local environment that the route is proposed to be built. Initial ideas and issues, especially constraints, which should be informed by early community engagement can be presented in a map format. Safety and the feeling of safety will need to be considered in developing proposals, particularly for women and girls.

5.4 Risk Register

A Risk Register with potential mitigations should be compiled at the start of the project and maintained throughout.

5.5 Required Use of Active Travel England Tools

ATE Tools Summary

Consultants are expected to utilise all the appropriate Active Travel England (ATE) tools including:

- Crossing Selector;
- Route Check;
- Route Cross-Section and
- Active Mode Appraisal Toolkit.

5.6 Road Safety Audit

The designs should be subject to a RSA1

5.6 Stakeholder & Resident Engagement

Engagement Summary:

We are concerned to have a good level of community engagement, which involves significant numbers of local residents and it will be important to work with intermediaries like West Faversham Community School, Bysing Wood Primary School, Ospringe Primary School and Sainsburys to ensure this happens.

Engagement activities could include online, Teams & in-person meetings, presentations, drop-in sessions and should include visualisations of initial concepts to effectively illustrate the proposed interventions. Experiential sessions which involve walking with local residents and community representatives and accompanying mobility aid users will also be important. These volunteers should be remunerated. These early engagements are learning exercises involving a certain amount of co-design.

Local Stakeholders include:

- Residents, workers
- Local Interest Groups
 - The Local Primary Schools – Bysing Wood and Ospringe
 - The two Faversham secondary schools - The Abbey and Grammar
 - Faversham Medical Practice
 - The local supermarket Sainsburys
 - Local distribution centres which are significant local employers
 - West Faversham Community Centre
- Politicians
 - Faversham Town Council which has an Active Travel Committee
 - Swale Borough Councillors for St Ann's Ward and Watling Ward
 - County Council Antony Hook County Council Member for Faversham
 - Helen Whately MP
- Borough Planners and Active Travel Officer
- Housing Associations responsible for stock in the area which include Moat, Hyde, Sage, Southern, West Kent and Place for People
- Transport Operators specifically Stagecoach, the Town Council through the Faversham Hopper, Southeastern Railway, Taxi operators
- Kent Police

Technical Stakeholders could include:

- Kent Highways
 - Highways Manager
 - Planning & Development
 - HIT Community & Engagement Manager
 - Major Projects
- Kent Public Rights of Way
- Kent Public Transport Team

- National Highways
- Bus Operators
- Network Rail
- Emergency Services
 - Ambulance
 - Fire
 - Police
- Walk Wheel Cycle Trust
- Utility Providers
 - Water/Sewage
 - Telecoms/digital
 - Gas
 - Electricity

5.6 Behaviour Change Opportunities

Behaviour Change initiatives go hand in hand with infrastructure interventions. Part of this study should include a recommendation of which behaviour change programmes with which groups and organisations would be most effective.

We are particularly keen to find ways to increase the volume of journeys taken by active travel to key locations like schools, the community centre, Sainsburys, and local employers.

Behaviour Change Programmes could include:

- Schools (KCC services)
 - School Travel Plans
 - Responsible Parking Toolkit
 - Active Travel Maps
 - Scootability
 - Bikeability
 - Small Steps
 - Kent Road Safety Club
 - Road Sense Road Safety
 - Walking Bus
 - Pollution Patrol
- Living Streets – Walk on Wednesday (WoW)
- Adult Cycle Training (KCC)
- Cycling UK – Big Bike Revival
- Cycling UK – Cycle Friendly Employer

6 Deliverables

6.1 Full Report

A full report is expected covering the results of the Scope of Work. A draft of the Full Report should be provided at least two weeks before the project deadline in order that it can be effectively reviewed.

6.2 Concept Drawings

List of Required Drawings: To be agreed with consultant

Designs should be LTN1/20 compliant and guided by ATE Design Guidance (24/25), Manual for Streets 1 & 2, LTN1/24, Streets for a Healthy Life (2022), Inclusive Mobility (2022) and Design for Walking (2015) and the principles laid out in Gear Change (2020). Designs should be ambitious, but Kent County Council needs to be realistic about what it can deliver in a large county with limited resources, therefore the designs may not be gold-plated but they should still be fit for purpose. Drawings of the proposed interventions are to be provided as Clean CAD files with PDF versions.

6.3 Risk Register

A Risk Register should be compiled along with potential resolutions.

6.3 Cost Estimation

Cost Estimate Summary: To include High level costings, along with risks and maintenance factors based on the submitted drawings and site visit observations.

7. Programme

Project Plan: To be agreed with consultant

Milestones: to be agreed with consultant

Engagement Timeline: To be agreed with consultant

This project must be delivered by March 2027.

8. Budget & Payment

Budget Details:

9. Submission Requirements

Methodology:

Experience:

Team:

Programme:

Fee Proposal:

10. Monitoring & Evaluation

To include: The study should include baseline data and suggested post-implementation monitoring

Faversham Walking Route 10 – Active Travel Ten-Year Plan Analysis

1.01: The forecast increase in the number of walking and cycling trips	5: The highest value of flow across the route is within the top quintile in relation to flow rates for all routes
1.02: The population who directly benefit from the route	2: The average population density of LSOAs across the route is in the second lowest quintile in relation to the average population across all routes
2.01: Connections to the overall network	5: This route has 2 or more connections to the existing or proposed network (i.e. the route touches multiple existing or proposed networks or the route touches one existing or proposed network in 2 or more places)
2.02: Contributions to active travel network (closing network gaps)	0: The average density of existing and proposed network surrounding the scheme is in the top quintile of averages for all schemes
2.03: Connection to bus services	3: The number of bus stops within the route are in the middle quintile in relation to bus stops across all routes
2.04: Connection to rail network / train stations	1: The number of passengers using train stations which the route passes within 100m of is in the bottom quintile in relation to passenger numbers across all routes
2.05: Part of an Active Travel Corridor	5: > 200 metres of the route does pass through what has been identified as an active travel corridor
3.01: Improvements in road safety	4: The number of accidents involving a cyclist and/or a pedestrian in the period along the route is within the second highest quintile in relation to accidents across all routes or over 20% of incidents that have occurred across the route were serious
3.02: Air quality impact	0: The route doesn't pass within 200m of an AQMA
4.01: Connectivity with trip attractors	2: The route passes within 400m of the second lowest quintile of key trip attractors in relation to the combined total key trip attractors of other routes
4.02: Tourist value	0: The route does not pass any tourist attractions
4.03: Green spaces	4: The total area of greenspace that the route passes is within the second highest quintile in comparison to all routes
4.04: Providing Access to Employment	2: The average employment density of the LSOAs across the route is within the second lowest quintile in relation to the average employment densities for all routes
4.05: Providing Access to Primary Education	2: The route passes primary schools which have the combined second lowest quintile of pupil numbers in relation the combined total pupil numbers of other routes
4.06: Providing Access to Secondary & Further Education	0: The route does not pass a secondary school or further education site
5.01: IMDs alignment - Income Deprivation	5: This route passes through the LSOA with a ranking within the highest quintile in comparison to all routes
5.02: IMDs alignment - Employment Deprivation	4: This route passes through the LSOA with a ranking within the second highest quintile in comparison to all routes

5.03: IMDs alignment - Education Skills and Training Deprivation	5: This route passes through the LSOA with a ranking within the highest quintile in comparison to all routes
5.04: IMDs alignment - Health Deprivation and Disability	5: This route passes through the LSOA with a ranking within the highest quintile in comparison to all routes
5.05: IMDs alignment - Crime	4: This route passes through the LSOA with a ranking within the second highest quintile in comparison to all routes
5.06: IMDs alignment - Barriers to Housing and Services	5: This route passes through the LSOA with a ranking within the highest quintile in comparison to all routes
5.07: IMDs alignment - Living Environment Deprivation	5: This route passes through the LSOA with a ranking within the highest quintile in comparison to all routes
5.08: Access to car/van or public transport use among target user groups	3: Between 1 and 1.5 cars or vans on average per household
6.01: Ecologically Sensitive Areas	5: This scheme does not pass through an ecologically sensitive area or SSI therefore new schemes will be easier to implement
6.02: Flooding Areas	0: This scheme passes through areas with a high flood risk for surface water
6.03: Sea level rise	3: The route is within the middle quintile for risk of sea level rising in comparison to all routes
6.04: Topography	5: The average difference between the highest and lowest topography levels across each kilometre the route is 0
7.01: Highway Boundary	5: The average percentage of the route that uses the highway network and PRow is within the highest quintile in comparison to all routes
7.02: LCWIP deliverability assessment	0: No rating available
7.03: Status (Draft adopted Undergone Consultation)	5: Adopted
7.04: Priority Scoring from its original source (LCWIP scoring)	2
Total Score	96.000000
Priority Ranking	142

