Auditor ID Date		SPACES FORM 1 ©2000
	9. Slope: (only assess on-road if no path is present)	24. Surveillance: (can be observed from a
Suburb	Flat or gentle slope 1	window, verandah, porch, garden)
Street	Moderate slope 2	Can be observed from more than 75% of buildings
Seg ID	Steep slope 3	Can be observed from between 50 –
1a. Type of buildings/ features: (tick all Side 1 Side 2	10. Condition of road:	74% of buildings 2
applicable)	Poor (a lot of bumps, cracks, holes)	Can be observed from less than
Transport infrastructure 0 0 0	Moderate (some bumps, cracks, holes) 2	50% of buildings
Housing 1 1	Good (very few bumps, cracks, holes) 3	Not applicable 4
Office 2 2 2 2 3 3	Under repair 4	25. Garden maintenance: (well maintained = looks trim & clean, looks kept)
Other retail 4 4	11. Number of lanes on road (in total):	More than 75% well maintained
Industrial 5 5	1 lane 1 2 or 3 lanes 2	Between 50 –74% well maintained 2
Educational 6 6	2 or 3 lanes 2 4 or 5 lanes 3	Less than 50% well maintained 3
Service 7 7 7 8 8	6 or more lanes 4	Not applicable 4
1b. Predominant buildings/	12. Vehicle parking	26. Verge maintenance: (well = looks trim
features: (tick ONE per Side 1 Side 2	restriction signs present:	& clean, looks kept)
side only)	No 2 2	More than 75% well maintained 1
Transport infrastructure 0 0 1	13. Kerb type: Side 1 Side 2	Between 50 –74% well maintained 2
Office 2 2	Mountable 1 1 1	Less than 50% well maintained 3
Convenience stores 3 3	Non-mountable 2 2 2	Verge undergoing work 4
Retail 4 4	No kerb 3 3	Not applicable 5
Industrial 5 5 Educational 6 6	14. Traffic control devices: (tick all applicable)	27. Number of verge trees: Side 1 Side 2
Service 7 7	Roundabouts 1	1 or more per house block Approx. 1 tree for every 2
Natural features 8 8	Speed humps or ramps 2 Chicanes, chokers, kerb extensions or	house blocks 2 2
1c. Are the predominant buildings/features	lane narrowing 3	Approx. 1 tree for every 3 or
the same for both sides?	Traffic signals 4	more nouse blocks
No 2	None 5	Go to Q29 ← No trees at all 4 4
A. Path for walking &/or cycling: (only if a	15. Other routes available:	28. Average height of trees: Side 1 Side 2
path present)	Access lane through cul-de-sac/no	Small (head high) 1 1
2. Type of path: Side 1 Side 2 Go to section B ← No path 1 1 1	through road 2	Medium (between head &
Footpath 2 2	Path through park 3 None 4	ceiling height) 2 2 Large (higher than a ceiling) 3
Shared path – with markings 3 3	16. Type of crossings:	_======================================
Shared path – no markings 4 4 4	Zebra or children 1	29. Cleanliness: (can you see any litter, rubbish, graffiti, broken glass, discarded
3. Path location: Side 1 Side 2	Traffic signals 2	items)
Next to road 1 1 1 1 1 Within 1m of kerb 2 2	Bridge/overpass 3 Underpass 4	Yes lots 1
Within 1m of kerb 2 2 2 3 3 3	Underpass 4 None 5	Yes some 2
Between 2 & 3m of kerb 4 4	17. Crossing aids: (tick all applicable)	None or almost none3
More than 3m from kerb 5 5	Median refuge or traffic island 1	30. Type of views: (tick all applicable)
4. Path material: Side 1 Side 2 Continuous concrete 1 1 1	Kerb extensions 2 None 3	Urban (houses & household
Concrete slabs 2 2	18. Streetlights present? Side 1 Side 2	gardens) 1 1 Commercial (shops, light industrial,
Paving bricks 3 3	Yes 1 1	offices, schools) 2
Gravel 4 4	Go to Q20 ← No 2 2 2	Water (such as river, ocean, lake) 3
Bitumen 5 5 6	19. Does lighting cover the	Tended nature (parks, community gardens tended, well maintained)
Grass or sand 6 6 7	path area? Side 1 Side 2	gardens tended, well maintained) 4 Nature (parks, community gardens
5. Slope: Side 1 Side 2	Yes 1 1	where level of care differs) 5
Flat or gentle 1 1	No 2 2	31. How alike are the building designs?
Moderate slope 2 2 2 3 3	20. Are destinations present in segment?	All of similar design 1
Steep slope 3 3 3 6. Path condition & Side 1 Side 2	$ \begin{array}{c c} $	Range of different designs 2 Not applicable (no buildings) 3
smoothness:	21. Number car parking facilities at	Not applicable (no buildings) 3
Poor (a lot of bumps, cracks,	destinations: (approx.)	32. How attractive would you rate this
holes & weeds) 1 1 1 1 Moderate (some bumps, 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 1- 21- 51- 71- 101	segment for walking?
cracks, holes & weeds) 2 2	(1) 20 50 70 100 + (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)	Very attractive 1 Attractive 2
Good (very few bumps,	Shops 1	Not attractive at all 3
cracks, holes & weeds) 3 3 4	School 2 Other 3	33. How physically difficult would you
Under repair 4 4 7. Permanent path	Other 22. Bike parking facilities:	rate this segment for walking?
obstructions: Side 1 Side 2	Bike locker or enclosure	Easy 1 Moderately difficult 2
Poles 1 1	Bike parking or U rails 2	Very difficult 3
Signs 2 2 2 Tables & chairs 3 3	Rack or stand 3	34. How attractive would you rate this
Trees 4 4	None 4	segment for cycling?
None 5 5	23. Driveway crossovers:	Very attractive 1 Attractive 2
R On road (all sogments)	Most buildings have one driveway	Not attractive at all 3
B On-road (all segments) 8. Path type:	Approx. ½ buildings have one driveway 2	35. How physically difficult would you
On-road cycle lane – marked 1	Approx ¼ buildings have one driveway 3	rate this segment for cycling? Easy 1
On-road – no lane marked 2	No driveways 4	Moderately difficult 2
		Very difficult 3

C. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Auditor ID Date		
Suburb		
Map ID		
36. Continuity of path		
Path forms useful & direct route 1		
Path is disjointed 2		
37. Neighbourhood legibility – ease of finding your way around the neighbourhood		
Very easy 1		
Fairly easy 2		
Not easy at all 3		