

LCWIP consultation dates

Following delays to the consultants completing the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), we are pleased to announce the dates for the drop in events for the upcoming public consultation.



The drop-in events for West Devon take place on Monday 23 September.

10 a.m. to 1 p.m. - Tavistock Town Hall

2 p.m. to 5 p.m. - Ockment Centre, Bellever Room, Okehampton

Alongside the drop in events there will be an online survey to gather views on the findings within the LCWIP.

This survey will be open for comments from 16 September and will remain open for 4 weeks online at: <https://activetravelshwd.commonplace.is/>

The final LCWIP report is due to be published at the end of November this year.

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)



Disclaimer

This e-mail is private and confidential and is intended only for use by the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or other action taken in reliance of the information contained in this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Furthermore, if you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and then delete this e-mail from your system. Incoming and outgoing e-mail messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications. This e-mail message has been scanned for computer viruses; however, no liability in respect of damage caused by any virus which is not detected will be accepted.

This email has been scanned for spam & viruses. If you believe this email should have been stopped by our filters, [click here](#) to rep

Briefing note on draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

For Tavistock Town Council DML Committee meeting 7/10/24

Introduction

The aim of the note is to support TTC in responding to the West Devon BC LCWIP consultation, currently being conducted the Commonplace platform via this link, which it is important to view in advance of the meeting: <https://activetravelshwd.commonplace.is/>. The briefing draws on the current draft [Neighbourhood Development Plan](#) (NDP) policies, and on the [evidence paper](#) provided by the NDP Steering Group to WDBC at an earlier stage in the LCWIP development. While pointing out some aspects the committee may wish to focus on in discussing the plan, it does not make recommendations on the response. Councillors will also want to take account of how people in their wards walk, wheel¹ or cycle, and problems they may encounter, particularly in accessing schools and other public facilities.

Scope of the LCWIP and consultation

The LCWIP aim to help people walk and cycle more often, fits with the NDP objective that “Getting around Tavistock on foot, by bicycle or using mobility aids / vehicles is an attractive and convenient option.”

The final outcome, covering the whole of South Hams and West Devon is expected to be

- A network plan of high priority walking and cycling routes
- A prioritised list of projects to improve walking and cycling infrastructure (if and when any funding becomes available)
- Reports which summarise the analysis that has been undertaken to identify the priority walking and cycling routes and how potential improvements have been identified²

Important caveats are that:

- The LCWIP can only include existing roads and cycle paths, and cannot assess or suggest cycle paths that pass over private land.
- Although it nevertheless identifies a wide range interventions to improve active travel in Tavistock, none are currently planned or have funding to be delivered.

The consultation invites comments, with a mix of scoring and free text, on:

- The priority routes identified– shown (in sections) on a zoomable online map
- Proposed interventions on the routes (individually numbered) – on another map³
- New barriers (i.e missed by the plan) on the routes, identified by “dropping a pin” on the map.

There is also a section on personal attitudes & experiences relating to active travel, which is not suited to an organisational response.

¹ As in the NDP, “wheeling” refers to use of wheelchairs / mobility aids / pushchairs.

² A paper copy of the draft reports was on show at the Tavistock drop in consultation on 23rd September – they are not linked to the online consultation.

³ Some of the dots showing interventions are a bit off the right place – words usually clear.

Comments can be made in any order. On making the first one, a new respondent is asked for an email address (not published) which the system then remembers, and some optional personal details – at which point they can say they are responding on behalf of a named organisation.

At this stage the scope and methodology of the LCWIP is settled, so the Committee will want to focus its response on ensuring the final plan contains interventions that benefit Tavistock and align with NDP objectives and policies.

Routes within Tavistock

Individual routes can be picked out by clicking on the map. For reference, a list is shown in the appendix, with those known to be close to TTC managed property highlighted.

The explanation notes “There may be many more routes outside of the LCWIP that are also important to residents, but the project currently focuses on those routes shown to have the greatest number of people who would use them.” In considering the relative priority of the routes within Tavistock, the Committee may wish to point out for the record any major omissions. Comparing the LCWIP with NDP maps 18A&B ([p116 & 117](#)) finds limited matching. While this is mainly because the NDP is concerned with opportunities that may arise in planning new developments, which is outside the LCWIP scope, interventions like those in the LCWIP could apply at Green Lane and to improve access to Viaduct Walk.

Interventions within Tavistock

There are nearly 60 of these: mainly “point” interventions eg reshaping a junction, or adding a dropped kerb, with some “line” ones, eg upgrading the surface of a section of path or (on the rural sections of through routes) lowering speed limits. Clicking on the relevant symbol on the map brings up a reference number and a very short description of what could be done there.

While all merit endorsement or critique from those familiar with the location, the Committee may wish to focus discussion time on the proposed interventions:

- On the riverside
- At roundabouts
- On streets in the primary shopping area
- Near Tavistock College
- Along Whitchurch Road

Possible additional aspects for comment

Public views gathered from the consultation are already showing people pinpointing barriers off the priority routes, and detailed suggestions on how best to implement some of the interventions. The Committee may want to ask WDBC about the potential for logging good ideas which do not fit the LCWIP framework, but could be discussed separately with Devon CC. This would fit with community action 10c of the NDP “Identify and seek mitigation for places where pedestrian infrastructure is inadequate (for example, absence of or narrow pavements).”

Cycle parking is not covered as a topic in the LCWIP, so TTC may wish to have separate discussions with WDBC and other stakeholders about how this can be improved in Tavistock.

[Briefing prepared by Tavistock NDP Steering Group Transport Lead (volunteer), 30/9/24]

Appendix: Priority Routes affecting Tavistock

Yellow – pass TTC managed property.

Passing through (“Inter-urban” – blue on online map)

WD_2 Bere Alston to Tavistock (entering along, ending Crowndale Road / Plymouth Rd junction, where it meets TV_W2A, TV_W2B and TV_W4E)

WD_3 Horrabridge to Tavistock (along NCN27 to the canal bridge by Tavistock College, then NCN270 to Quant Park on roads & Viaduct Walk, then Drake Road to town centre meeting TV_W4A,B &C)

WD_4 Horrabridge to Whitchurch along Whitchurch Rd (ends at entrance to Whitchurch Primary School, where it meets TV_W1C and TV_W1D))

Within Tavistock (“Intra-urban” – red on online map)

TV1

TV_W1A (Bedford Sq / West St jn to Dolvin Rd / Whitchurch Rd rdbt. Meets TV_W2A & TV_W1B)

TV_W1B (Whitchurch Rd between Dolvin Rd and Westmoor Park, meets TV_3A, TV_W1C, TV_W6A)

TV_W1C (Whitchurch Rd from Westmoor Pk to Whitchurch School, where meets TV_W1D & WD_4)

TV_W1D (Whitchurch Rd to Oak Rd around Whitchurch School, meets WD_3)

TV2

TV_W2A (Abbey Bridge to Plymouth Rd along Riverside Walk & through Meadows, short overlap with TV_W6A, meets TV_W2B, TV_W4A)

TV_W2B (Plymouth Rd from Crowndale Rd to cemetery, meets WD_2 & TV_W2C)

TV_W2C (Plymouth Rd from cemetery to Lidl crossing, short overlap with WD_2)

TV3

TV_W3A (Deer Park Lane from Plymouth Rd to & through cut to Down Rd, meets TV_W3B)

TV_W3B (Down Rd, from cut to Deer Park to top cattle grid, meets TV_W3C)

TV_W3C (Down Rd from top cattle grid via southern part of loop to Whitchurch Down)

TV4

TV_W4A (Brook St & Duke St, where it meets TV_W1A, TV_W4B & WD_3)

TV_W4B (West St, meeting TV_W5A & TV_W4C)

TV_W4C (Ford St, meeting TV_W4D)

TV_W4D (Drakes Villas, ie Callington Rd – Drake roundabouts, meeting TV_W4E)

TV_W4E (Plymouth Road from Drake roundabout to Crowndale Rd, meeting WD_2 & TV_W2A&B)

TV5

TV_W5A (Spring Hill between West St & Watts Rd (hospital) junctions)

TV_W5B (Hospital & western part of Watts Rd, where it meets TV_5C)

TV_W5C (Watts Rd to Tremayne Rise, where it meets TV_W5D)

TV_W5D (Tremayne Rise to Montgomery Drive)

TV6

TV_W6A (NCN27 from Plymouth Rd to the canal bridge by Tavistock College, via St Johns Walk & the Meadows)

Your views matter - have your say



South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council are developing a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) - and we want to hear from you. An LCWIP is put together with the aim of creating long-term networks and routes for everyday walking and cycling.

Would you like to cycle and walk more? What is stopping you from doing that right now? To help us with planning for future infrastructure, we would like your views on the routes in the LCWIP and what the main barriers are to walking and cycling along these routes.

Your local knowledge is vitally important to this survey. No construction has been pre-planned. Should funding for active travel projects become available, your feedback will help the development of these projects. We will consult residents again if any detailed plans arise from this questionnaire.

Understanding your experiences

To what extent are the following issues a priority for you?

	Not a priority	Somewhat of a priority	A crucial priority	Not sure
Reducing road danger	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tackling air pollution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reducing noise pollution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Health and wellbeing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Your views on the routes identified



Modelling has been undertaken to identify walking and cycling routes with the highest demand in the area. These have been split into **intra-urban** (red on the map below) walking and cycling routes (typically these are routes completely within a town) and **inter-urban** (blue on the map below) cycling routes (typically these are routes connecting two or more settlements).

Preferred routes have been identified, along which improvements (interventions) can be made for cycling and/or walking/wheeling. It is important to note that there are no proposed schemes with funding at this stage, but potential schemes can be pursued if funding becomes available.

VIEW THE PRIORITY ROUTES





The LCWIP can only include existing roads and cycle paths, and cannot assess or suggest cycle paths that pass over private land. We acknowledge that there will be many more routes that are important to residents, but at this time this project focuses on those routes shown to have the greatest number of people who would use them.

Inter-urban route

These are routes connecting two or more communities, identified in blue on the map above. Please use the map to explore the suggested routes before responding.

Do you agree with the proposed inter-urban routes?

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

To what extent to you agree that these routes connect to the right destinations?

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

If you disagree, why is this?

Select one or more options

It's missing important routes

- routes**
- It lacks alternative options**
- The routes don't connect to the right destinations**
- The current routes are unsuitable for walking**
- The current routes are unsuitable for cycling**

Any other comments on why you disagree with the routes?

Intra-urban route

These are routes within one single community, identified in red on the map above. Please use the map to explore the suggested routes before responding.

Do you agree with the proposed intra-urban routes?

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

To what extent do you agree that these routes connect to the right destinations?

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

If you disagree, why is this?

Select one or more options

It's missing important routes

It lacks alternative options

The routes don't connect to the right destinations

The current routes are unsuitable for walking

The current routes are unsuitable for cycling

Any other comments on why you disagree with the routes?

Your views on barriers to walking and cycling

Walking

Please let us know your views on barriers that prevent you walking in your area.

To what extent do you agree that the following barriers prevent you from walking in your local area?

	Agree	Somewhat	Not really	Not at all
Safety at night	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Places to cross roads	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Amount of traffic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Narrow pavements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Poor signage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Distances are too long	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knowledge of the area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please add any other main barrier to walking not listed above?

Cycling

Please let us know your views on barriers that prevent you cycling in your area.

To what extent do you agree that the following barriers prevent you from cycling in your local area?

	Agree	Somewhat	Not really	Not at all
Amount of traffic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Safety at night	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Poor road surfaces	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Safe road crossings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knowledge of cycle routes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Poor signage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Limited cycle parking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Not owning a bike	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The weather	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Steep hills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Narrow roads	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please add any other main barrier to cycling not listed above?