Llangattock Active Travel Scheme
Consultation Summary Report (2025 & 2026)

This report combines the 2025 consultation findings, including the school travel surveys, with the 2026 consultation results. It provides an overview of respondent sentiment, compares the outcomes of both consultations, and summarises the principal objections raised during the 2026 consultation.

Scheme Background

The proposed Active Travel scheme originates from the Active Travel Network Map process, during which stakeholders and members of the community identified the need for a safer active travel route linking Llangattock, the local school and Crickhowell. Subsequent engagement activities demonstrated support for improved walking and cycling facilities and highlighted concerns regarding traffic volumes and vehicle speeds within the village. The scheme was therefore developed to address these issues, with the design proposals informed by feedback received throughout the engagement process. Due to the unique character of the village and the physical constraints present along the route, the proposals presented during the consultation are considered to represent the only currently identified practicable engineering solution capable of delivering a continuous off-highway route to the school whilst meeting the scheme's safety objectives.

2025 Consultation Results

The 2025 consultation received 132 responses: 98 opposed (74%), 21 supportive (16%) and 13 mixed/undecided (10%). Key concerns included parking loss, impacts on residents, traffic management, village character, and safety concerns.

2025 School Survey Findings

School surveys undertaken with pupils and parents at Llangattock Primary School and pupils from Llangattock attending Crickhowell High School identified support for measures that improve walking and cycling. Key themes included road safety improvements, improved footways, enhanced crossing facilities, reduced traffic impacts, better links between Llangattock and Crickhowell and traffic calming measures. Amongst surveyed high school pupils, 62% indicated they would be encouraged, or could potentially be encouraged, to walk or cycle more if suitable improvements were introduced.

2026 Consultation Results

The 2026 consultation received 149 responses. Of these, 137 respondents (92%) opposed the scheme, and 12 respondents (8%) supported it. Despite design amendments following the 2025 consultation, public opposition increased.

Comparison Between 2025 and 2026

Total responses increased from 132 to 149 (+17). Opposition increased from 98 to 137 responses and rose from 74% to 92%. Support fell from 21 to 12 responses and fell from 16% to 8%. Whilst the consultation responses were predominantly negative, the school survey findings identified continued support for measures that improve walking, cycling and road safety for children and young people.

Main Objections Raised During the 2026 Consultation

The dominant theme arising from the 2026 consultation related to concerns about parking. Respondents consistently raised the following issues:

- Loss of existing on-street parking provision.
- Potential impacts on residents who rely on nearby parking.
- Concerns regarding accessibility for older people and those with limited mobility.
- Potential impacts on visitors, customers, and local businesses.
- Concerns that displaced parking could create problems elsewhere within the village.
- Wider concerns that the benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the perceived loss of parking.

For context, the scheme proposals involve the removal of a single layby with capacity for approximately two vehicles. No other formal parking bays are proposed for removal. However, the proposed waiting restrictions would affect a section of highway that is regularly used by local residents for vehicle parking. Consultation responses demonstrated that concerns extended beyond the removal of the layby and encompassed the broader implications of the restrictions, including the potential displacement of vehicles to other parts of the village.

It should also be noted that the scheme drawings identify a potential small increase in resident parking within Clos Ciliau. However, these spaces fall outside the highway boundary, would require separate approval by the housing department, and would be for resident use only. Consequently, they would not directly offset the loss of the layby or the wider parking restrictions proposed as part of the scheme. Consultation responses indicate that concerns regarding parking remained despite the inclusion of potential additional resident parking within the scheme drawings.

Although other issues were identified, including highway layout alterations and impacts on village character, parking-related concerns represented the most consistent and frequently cited reason for opposition during the 2026 consultation.

Conclusion

The consultation evidence demonstrates increasing public opposition between 2025 and 2026. However, the school travel surveys indicate support for measures that improve road safety, pedestrian infrastructure, crossing facilities, and opportunities for active travel. This highlights a distinction between overall public sentiment towards the scheme and the views expressed by many school pupils and parents regarding active travel improvements.