

# LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (LCWIP)

## Formal Consultation Report

## Consultation Team

**Author:** Policy & Research, BCP  
Council

**Date:** January 2022





**Transforming Travel**

## Contents Page

greener | healthier | better connected

Contents Page .....	1
Introduction .....	2
Methodology.....	2
Communications Report.....	3
Survey Results .....	3
Appendix .....	18



**Transforming Travel**

greener | healthier | better connected

## Introduction

The LCWIP will be BCP Council's long-term strategic plan setting out the cycling and walking vision and the infrastructure that is required across the area. The LCWIP sets out the council's long-term vision and proposals for investment in a network of walking and cycling routes and infrastructure across the region including cycle parking and potential 'livable neighbourhoods'. It builds on and connects with existing cycle and walking provision, showcasing the council's ongoing, ambitious commitment to active travel and the critical role it plays in reducing local traffic congestion and carbon emissions. The plan contains timings for the improvements over a 15-year period and prioritised routes with the greatest potential to increase levels of walking and cycling.

Feedback from the local community will inform the final LCWIP which is due to be published in the new year. Central government has explicitly stated that local authorities with LCWIPs will be better positioned to secure future funding for sustainable transport.

Initial engagement on BCP Council's LCWIP, undertaken in spring 2021, received over 3,000 views on the council's online engagement platform. 390 people completed surveys and 796 people used the interactive maps to comment on identified locations. [Feedback](#) has been incorporated into the formal plan, which is now being published for public consultation.

The BCP LCWIP will demonstrate that the Council has developed a strategic plan for investment, based on technical evidence and with inputs from the public and key stakeholders. The formal consultation ran from:



**1 November – 12 December 2021**

## Methodology

The formal consultation was run online using Engagement HQ which received a total of:



**3.1k views**

Respondents could provide their feedback via:



A survey (hosted on Snap surveys)



**Transforming Travel**

## Communications

greener | healthier | better connected

To assist with the marketing of LCWIP consultations, the Transforming Travel communications team built a dedicated [LCWIP web page](#) for people to visit and find out more. Press releases were also distributed about the commencement of consultations which gained a small, but important amount of coverage in local media, particularly from Business titles. Finally, the LCWIP consultations were the subject of a number of launch and reminder social media posts which gained good coverage and mixed sentiment feedback.



**Transforming Travel**

greener | healthier | better connected

## Survey Results

This section of the report details the survey results. All questions in this survey were open ended comments questions; therefore qualitative analysis has been undertaken.



177 respondents in total

**Question 1 - Having read through Section 4, do you have any comments on the LCWIP targets and objectives? For example, are they ambitious enough? Do you have any concerns?**



166 comments

*Figure 1 - Themes of comments*

Themes	No of comments
General concerns/negative comments	51
Positive comments	32
Targets and objectives are under ambitious	21
The effect on motor vehicles	19
Need to consider the older people and people with disabilities	14
Children/schools	12
Targets and objectives are over ambitious	12
Need more of a focus on walking and safety of walking	10
Need to consider public transport	6
Should be more cyclist/walking priority	6
Need to implement rules for cyclists	6
Area specific comments	5
Not related to LCWIP	3
E scooters	3
Maintenance of changes	2
Parking	2
Incentives are needed	2
Park and ride	2

*Base: 166 respondents*



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

**General concerns/ negative comments:** Comments here were against the LCWIP programme and believed that changes would add to congestion and have a negative effect on motorists.

**Positive comments:** Comments here praised and agreed with the targets and objectives.

**Targets and objectives are under ambitious:** Comments here centred around what more could be done.

- *"I do not think they are ambitious enough, although a great start. I would like to see an objective relating to carbon footprint and the Paris Agreement for decarbonisation of transport by 2030 by a certain amount, is it 78%? This could be in the first target 'in keeping with the requirements to decarbonise transportation for the Paris Agreement'. As a general principle I think we should state that we will build all junctions with an expectation for zero deaths to all road users, and that we will be aiming for zero deaths on all our roads. I would like to see an objective about secondary school aged children getting to school - for 90% of children within a 2 mile radius of their secondary school cycling/walking/scooting to school. (you could add bus into that target too if that made it easier). I would like to see a more ambitious target for primary aged children."*
- *"There should be more emphasis on "Better Streets" (Gear Change): incorporating traffic management to improve the public realm, target local traffic neighbourhoods and alternative cycle/walking routes away from main roads. Such a large investment programme could and should be transformation for residential areas."*
- *"I think you could add an ambition for green spaces to be included wherever possible, as changes are made to accommodate more walking and cycling. For mental health as well as environmental reasons. Cycle and walking paths are far more likely to be used if they are pleasant as well as safe. I think the target for 55% primary school pupil journeys to be walk/scoot/cycle seems very low/easy compared with the 50% target for all journeys, which seems very (but rightly) ambitious."*
- *"Should be more ambitious in terms of introducing additional 20mph limits in residential areas and low traffic neighbourhoods. By making it easier to use active travel and simultaneously more costly (in time) to use a motor vehicle, other objectives might be more easily reached."*

**Need to consider the older people and people with disabilities:** Comments were around how those who are unable to walk and cycle would be considered in the plans.

- *"The LCWIP covers Walking and Cycling, but I think the vision needs to acknowledge the equality issues around wheeled mobility devices, which often favour the road over bumpy pavements, and have to negotiate cars parked inconsiderately, I often see them using cycleways, which is fine, but considering them with walking may not be."*
- *"I wonder if there should be a clearer objective for elderly/less able bodied users."*
- *"Not specific enough dates and targets are loose. Too easy to not do anything. Older population doesn't mean not active. I am in this group and consider myself active and advantaged by having time to walk or cycle where working people may not have. This should be an advantage to you. My key linked priority would be safety of the routes as an older person."*





## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

**Children/schools:** Comments varied but some highlighted importance to on the journey to school

- *"The target for walking should be for every child to have a legally safe walked route to school, using Road Safety GB's guide Assessment of Walked Routes to School."*
- *"Why aren't secondary school pupils included? Needs to include something on making walking and cycling the most direct route to a destination so it becomes more desirable than driving."*

**Targets and objects are over ambitious:** Comments here argued that the changes would be unlikely to change behaviour and there are not enough cyclists to justify.

- *"Over ambitious. Despite the congestion currently in the conurbation it is totally unrealistic to believe that the congestion will be very much better with the introduction of so many cycle lanes. In the winter few people will cycle to work as very difficult to carry anything on a cycle. When it rains cyclists and walkers tend to disappear. The council are dreaming if they think they can change the mindset of people travelling to work, Cyclists ride for pleasure and that tends to be in places of interest not town centres. The majority of cyclists also tend to be younger (students and schoolchildren ) who wouldn't be using cars anyway."*
- *"The objectives are overly ambitious and do not take enough account of the older than average population and the fact that this is a popular holiday destination."*



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

### Question 2 - Having read through the Technical Report, do you have any comments about the methodology used?



115 comments

Figure 2 - Themes of comments

Theme	No of comments
Negative comment/general concerns	22
Positive comments	21
Concerns with evidence used	19
Criticism of consultation	12
Inclusivity of different groups	6
Public transport	4
Schools	4
Environment	3
Areas missing	3
Weather	2
Timescales	1
Secure parking	1

Base: 115 respondents

**Negative comment/general concerns:** Comments here mainly centred around a negative feeling for the whole LCWIP programme in general, where changes are believed to negatively affect congestion and motorists.

**Positive comments:** Comments showed agreement for the methodology used.

**Concerns with evidence used:** Comments here varied but some respondents questioned the figures used.

- *"Concentration on travel to work and school journeys (because the census counts them) potentially underplays the significant opportunities to support shopping, leisure and other journeys. There needs to be thought given to travel to and through the local district centres, the 70 or so "where I live" areas, to cover local utility journeys. We need more baselining of actual usage and the barriers to use. I would have liked to see reference to the 1000+ improvements crowdsourced via WidenMyStreet, and recognition highlighting poor current quality links, eg that along Dorset Way. And I thought an Audit was being undertaken of these, the network maps seem to suggest they are done, when many are very substandard width and/or style. Walking permeability is not just about crossing points, but especially barriers - rail/dual carriageway/ivers - and whether bridges/tunnels are suitable."*
- *"Whilst the demographics of the area are mentioned as challenging in objectives section of the plan, there is no analysis of them in the technical report, and so it appears no consideration of how these challenges may influence what needs to be delivered. It would be great to have seen wider consideration of the need for walking outside journeys to commercial areas e.g. walking around key bus routes and walking routes ensure green spaces are accessible."*





## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

- *“Disappointed schools are classed as a secondary destination. Surely the safety of young people should be higher priority. Bearing in mind congestion issues in the summer all routes to and from beaches should be primary. The 2011 census data is out of date. Beryl Bike data would appear to be the most up to date data yet some of the most popular Beryl routes aren't shown as primary in your plans. Gyms/sports centres/swimming pools should be primary destinations. You talk about busy streets without defining what you mean. Why are pedestrians being sent via Sandbanks Road in Poole when Whitecliff Road/Keyhole Bridge is the most obvious direct route for many journeys.”*

**Criticism of consultation:** Comments mainly centred on how there were too many documents to read through and also ensuring different groups are heard.

- *“The filtering criteria are thorough, but not enough local user input and creativity to identify preferred routings and opportunities for traffic management / neighbourhood improvements.”*

**Question 3 - Having read through Sections 5 and 6, do you have any comments on our approach to developing and prioritising walking and cycling infrastructure?**



157 comments

Figure 3 - Themes of comments

Theme	No of comments
Positive comments	40
General concerns	33
Specific areas	30
Pavements/paths	20
Need to consider pedestrians more	14
Inclusivity of all groups	14
Negative effect on motor vehicles	13
Safety of cyclists	13
Public transport	8
Schools	6
Need a comms campaign	4
Environment	4
Speeding	4
Cycle parking	3
Park and ride/parking	3
Timescales	2
Escooters	1

Base: 157 respondents

**Positive comments:** Comments praised and agreed with the Council's approach to development and prioritising of cycling and walking.

**General concerns:** Comments were against the changes to local areas and did not believe they would make any difference.

**Specific areas:** Comments highlighted specific areas that needed attention such as areas that were missing from the plans and also complaints about Keyhole Bridge.

- "There's no cycle path connecting Muscliff/Throop with the airport, which considering the traffic problems in Parley should be a priority."
- "Obvious gaps in tier 2 - Merley, Bearcross, Somerford, Walkford. The Tier 1 key walking routes are very radial, this doesn't represent a good network approach, but putting up with historical provision. Would be good to also highlight key traffic generators, and key barriers to direct links. There are some sections of roads with no pavement, these should surely be a priority to fix."



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

- *"I think you should add Whitecliff Road - Keyhole Bridge - Poole Park - Birds Hill Road to the 'Key Walking Route Network' in Figure 4 for Poole town centre as this is a logical route for people to not only walk between the parks but also to safely access the hospital, churches and schools in the Longfleet and surrounding areas. This is a much better option than the busy congested Sandbanks Road route that is currently shown going to the civic centre one way system."*
- *"Safe walking route through Keyhole Bridge is needed. It should be closed to through traffic."*
- *"In Fig 1 I think that it should show links between Wimborne and Merley as Wimborne is only 2Km walk away and should be included as it is part of the greater urban area if not in BCP. In Fig 4 Keyhole Bridge in Poole Park should be a Key Walking Route as the route suggested is not suitable because, a) it is further to walk, b) unpleasant walking on Sandbanks Road with the continual traffic, c) the bridge on Sandbanks Road is narrow and has a narrow pavement on one side only and there is no near crossing if you are wanting to stay on the west side of the road."*
- *"The need for more direct East-West walking and cycling routes need much more focus eg Poole>Bournemouth>Christchurch this is where most congestion exists and where SAFE cycling and walking routes are NOT prioritised."*

**Pavements/paths:** Comments varied but some comments argued that shared paths were dangerous, cars are parking on paths and the importance of maintaining paths.

- *"Yes, they should be kept separate. Cycle tracks on pavements are dangerous for cyclists and walkers."*
- *"Walking on pavements is often difficult due pavement parking, uneven surfaces & especially over hanging vegetation."*
- *"There is no proper mention of how parked cars are a barrier to crossing the road, especially as cars are getting bigger and bigger. Currently the BCP STEPs road safety education program teaches kids in year 4 how to cross the road between cars. I appreciate this is a practical necessity with the infrastructure status quo, but the LCWIP is an opportunity to change street infrastructure by narrowing wider radius curbs, and placing build outs on long stretches of parking so that pedestrians can see vehicles coming."*
- *"Shared used paths need to be wider to cause less rows, cycle lanes in roads should be cleaned like the rest of the road as a bunch of leaves on the side of the road can cause a cyclist to fall off unlike a car."*

**Need to consider pedestrians more:** Comments argued that there needs to be more of a focus for pedestrians.

- *"Cycling seems to be prioritised over walking."*
- *"This again is not about walkers and every day road users this is all about cyclists."*
- *"A significant omission in the core walking zones is the absence of designated core walking routes between the 3 urban centres of Poole, Bournemouth and Christchurch. The core walking zones do not overlap, leaving the suggestion that pedestrians will have difficulty walking from Poole to Bournemouth for example."*



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

- *"I feel walking is being neglected badly in all new infrastructure, far more members of BCP walk than cycle, this cannot be allowed to continue. Funds need to be prioritised accordingly to benefit the masses."*

**Inclusivity of all groups:** Comments mainly questioned if those who cannot walk or cycle (such as older people and people with disabilities) had been considered.

- *"Has enough consideration been given to the aging population? A lot of people here are unable to walk or cycle far at all."*
- *"Walking improvements such as better lighting and cleaner pathways are good news. However, the cycling infrastructure will take away valuable car parking spaces – including for disabled users nearer to shops and amenities."*
- *"There are high numbers of pensioners in BCP many of whom will struggle to cycle and be able to walk far.. Having good tramlines will also enable people to use cars much less."*

**Negative effect on motor vehicles:** Comments argued that the LCWIP would have negative consequences for motor vehicles.



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

### Question 4: Having read through Section 7, do you have any comments on liveable neighbourhoods?



126 comments

Figure 4 - Themes of comments

Theme	No of comments
Positive comments	39
General concerns/negative comments	31
Focus on specific areas	15
Negative for motorists	14
Need even more liveable neighbourhoods	10
Listen to residents that live there	9
Environmental factors	5
Inclusive to all groups	5
Public Transport	5
Consideration of new developments	5
Schools	4
Crime/enforcement	3
Need to consider walking more	2
Maintenance	1
Beryl bikes/e-scooters	1
Cycle parking	1

Base: 126 respondents

**Positive comments:** Comments here praised and agreed with liveable neighbourhoods.

**General concerns/negative comments:** Comments were against the changes to local areas and did not believe they would make any difference.

**Focus on specific areas:** Comments here highlighted certain areas in need of attention.

- *"It's a difficult issue, but it also presents a golden opportunity for levelling up, in other words, don't just stop the 'rat runs' in posher areas, but across the more disadvantaged areas as a priority. I'm not clear why the deprivation measure is marked as not being assessed in the delivery plan. Isn't this an important factor?"*
- *"All the examples are from Poole. This could be down to familiarity of the officers involved with work done in Poole, but if it's because there are no good examples in Bournemouth or Christchurch, that shows how much work there is to do."*
- *"It seems that it depends on the financial wellbeing of an area to have liveable neighbourhoods as one of the most popular 'blockades' was under keyhole bridge which enabled people to walk freely from Poole Park to Baiter. Residents living near the Civic Centre in Poole have complained about the extra length of their journeys as the road closures in these areas mean more traffic is added to already busy junctions - I think it helps if you*



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

*have 'local' residents input on each scheme - you can plan better and fully understand areas more."*

**Negative for motorists:** Comments here argued that liveable neighbourhoods will have an adverse effect on congestion and motorists.





## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

**Question 5: Having read through Section 9, do you have any comments on our Delivery plan?**



128 comments

Figure 5 - Themes of comments

Theme	No of comments
Negative comments/disagreement with LCWIP	37
Positive comment	19
Specific area comments	19
Timescales	19
Need resident input	9
Safety of cyclists and pedestrians	9
Schools	5
Plans are too ambitious	4
Public transport	4
Need a map in delivery plan	3
Inclusivity	3
E scooters	2
Enforcement	1
Maintenance	1
Comms campaign	1
Motorbikes	1

Base: 128 respondents

**Negative comments/disagreement with LCWIP:** Comments were against the changes, did not believe they would make any difference and believed funds could be spent elsewhere.

**Positive comments:** Comments here praised and agreed with the Delivery Plan.

**Specific area comments:** Comments here mainly drew attention to specific areas that need attention.

- “The delivery plan, if achieved at the time scale outlined, looks good. I would particularly concentrate on routes that link the three towns. For example, the roads between Poole and Bournemouth, such as Bournemouth road/Ashley road/Poole road are so congested it makes walking and cycling intimidating and unsafe. So whilst I welcome all the routes outlined in the Delivery Plan, I would encourage a focus on corridor routes between the towns.”
- “I hope the route from Poole to Bournemouth Hospital will be prioritised.”
- “The delivery plan includes “TCF S5 - Poole to Ferndown and Wimborne” and makes mention of partnership with Dorset Council but no detail of how this would be continued north of Merley, ie Merley to Wimborne. Whilst this may be outside of the BCP remit, it would be useful to indicate what will carry on North above the Sour to Wimborne. Currently the route for cycling from Merley to Schools in Wimborne is treacherous, including narrow shared pavements.”



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

- *"I am fine with the approach but would say that, as an example, the Fairmile road/Hurn road "secondary" route cited is currently so dangerous that it would actually be safer if deleted. A "light touch" approach here would not work."*

**Timescales:** Comments here argued that the Delivery Plan is too long term and wanted projects to be delivered sooner.

- *"My main concern is "too little, too late". The aim to get >50% of journeys by bike or walking by 2030 cannot succeed when most of the network will not be in place by then."*
- *"I understand the emphasis on primary routes. I do however hope that the development of secondary routes is not neglected, not least because they are absolutely necessary if we are to realise the "mesh network" goal, required if significant modal shift is to be obtained."*
- *"Disappointed on timescale and in particular putting changes around Pokesdown/Southbourne/Overcliff in 7-10 years. Real shame timescales are so long term for all projects."*



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

**Question 6: Are there any positive or negative impacts of this proposal that you believe that BCP Council should take into account in relation to equalities or human rights?**



109 comments

Figure 6 - Themes of comments

Theme	No of comments
Consideration of people with disabilities	29
Must consider all equality groups	21
General concerns	18
Specific areas	11
Concerns of taking away parking	8
Consult wider	7
Concerns for motor vehicles	6
Safety of pedestrians/consideration of pedestrians	5
Positive comments	3
Crime/theft	2
Schools	2
Weather concerns	2

Base: 109 respondents

**Consideration of people with disabilities:** Comments drew attention to how people with disabilities could be negatively affected and how people with disabilities would utilise facilities.

- “Is there a reason why many pedestrian crossings no longer make a noise to indicate when to cross? Is this an issue for people with sight issues?”
- “More thought must be given to the disabled and particularly the vision-impaired. It is well known that shared space upsets guide dogs and the blind cannot navigate the areas safely. Please consider the problem of the high raised kerbs along all the cycle ways for anyone with difficulty seeing or walking.”
- “As someone who is disabled I would want to cycle more. I want to be more active. These changes will provide that. Ideally I want to see them go further. It's important we don't see disability as something that mean we need to drive and use a blue badge. The right for disabled people to be active and access cycling should outweigh outdated notions of 'car is king'”
- “Please consider disabled cyclists - they do exist but will require safe routes - sending a disabled child cyclist down a 'quiet route' with no segregation from vehicles means that vehicles can still pass closely - it only takes one to cause an accident.”
- “This plan will have a disproportionate impact on disabled people and women and the elderly. This is because disabled residents rely on cars more than others.”



## Transforming Travel

greener | healthier | better connected

**Must consider all equality groups:** Comments varied but some comments drew attention to the importance of considering different groups such as women, children and different age groups.

- *"I think there is an issue around the lack of consideration of age, gender and disability in the technical plans. I appreciate the importance of creating a strategic network, but it would be great to see a gender balanced cost/benefit analysis of the investments planned. Women and children benefit greatly from small local changes that can be overlooked in strategic schemes focused on commercial centres, and will benefit more from the additional benefits of work around schools and low traffic neighbourhoods, making those smaller journeys easier to trip chain into active travel commuting."*
- *"Please ensure there are limited areas for women to be alone, particularly in the winter when it's dark. Well lit paths and ideally no gravel (slows down bikes with harder tyres) to limit possibility of being stranded/alone and attacked."*
- *"Circulate this policy to all BCP council staff working with people with all of the protected characteristics and encourage them to make their client groups aware of this document on cycling and walking. Don't restrict interpretation of equality to physical disabilities which restrict mobility amongst people who have access to cars. Race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity and being trans can all impact a person's decision as to whether the walking or cycling infrastructure is useful for them. Putting people more at risk of attack through underpasses for example such as the roundabout by Bournemouth station, basically shuts off the pedestrian route for anyone, including myself, and should be considered as part of the equality impact assessment. The policy of routing pedestrians through underpasses has more or an impact on those of us with protected characteristics."*

**General concerns:** Comments here were against the changes, did not believe they would make any difference and believed funds could be spent elsewhere.

**Specific areas:** Comments drew attention to specific areas.

- *"Removal of disabled parking near shops and amenities is a concern. This has been seen at Evening Hill - where easy access for disabled people to enjoy the viewpoint was removed."*
- *"Your decision to reopen Keyhole Bridge Poole has a negative effect on those with disabilities particularly wheelchair and partially sighted users as there is no usable pavement."*
- *"Disabled people would clearly struggle to walk through the bridge in Sandbanks Road."*
- *"As a disabled person the keyhole bridge being open to traffic has caused severe difficulty for me in using the park and traveling to Whitecliff."*

**Concerns of taking away parking:** Comments here were based around the negative effects of losing parking, especially for the disabled.

- *"Yes, cycle lanes mean disabled road users cannot park as close as they need, so these adversely affect their quality of life."*
- *"Physical and mental health challenges can restrict someone's ability to cycle, walk, or take public transport. It's important that the town centres remain accessible by car and that parking is still available. Drivers shouldn't feel demonised."*

## Appendix

Group	Breakdown	Number of respondents
Gender	Male	106
	Female	42
	Prefer not to say	21
Age	16 – 24 years	4
	25 - 34 years	13
	35 - 44 years	21
	45 - 54 years	23
	55 – 64 years	36
	65+ years	53
	Prefer not to say	20
Disability	Yes – limited a lot	13
	Yes – limited a little	29
	No	108
	Prefer not to say	18
Ethnicity	White British	130
	White Other	5
	BME	4
	Prefer not to say	25
Religion	No religion	75
	Christian	55
	Other religion	4
	Prefer not to say	30
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	115
	All other sexual orientations	10
	Prefer not to say	37