DfT

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Guidance Update

1) Each county/region should have a strategic ATIP (Active Travel Infrastructure Plan), this should be co-ordinated and cross referenced with each LCWIP to ensure there are no gaps and every area has access to walking and cycling routes.

2) Consultation with Town/Parish councils, local active travel groups and other stakeholders such as CyclingUK should be mandatory. LCWIPs and ATIPs should not be able to be signed off without evidence of this and statements from these key stakeholders that the authors have included their routes.

3) The scope of each LCWIP should ensure that routes that lead to destinations in neighbouring LCWIPs are contiguous and that no area is excluded from plans. Routes to destinations across a county boundary should not be used as an excuse to ignore routes.

4) There should be no limit to the number of routes identified in each ATIP or LCWIP. More routes should be encouraged as this creates more opportunities for funding to be obtained.

5) All IPs should be live, wiki style documents with updates proposed by interested parties not unreasonably withheld by a local authority, with revisions published on at least an annual basis, more frequently if required.

6) A council's approach to delivering LCWIPs should contribute to the ATE capability score.

7) There needs to be more emphasis on the legal status and importance of an LCWIP.

8) A section on the difference between planning (high level route sketches that can be done quickly and with minimal resource) vs. Design (lower level and more detailed plans that take longer). LCWIPs should *NOT* stray into design.

9) High vehicle traffic destinations including all schools and organisations adjacent to car parks should be automatically be prioritised, so that the purpose of the LCWIP is to provide safe walking and cycling routes to these destinations and reduce car dependency.