

Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru / National Assembly for Wales  
Pwyllgor yr Economi, Seilwaith a Sgiliau/ Economy, Infrastructure and Skills  
Committee  
Deddf Teithio Llesol (Cymru) 2013 / Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013  
Ymateb gan Beic Fforwm Gar / Evidence from Carmarthenshire Cycling  
Forum

a/ How far are the stated objectives been achieved - from our perspective as a Cycling campaigning group then since the Act in 2013 the County Councils' have focussed entirely on the ERM and INM process to the extent that cycle route development and cycle facilities have been totally ignored!

b/ Effectiveness of subordinate legislation and guidance- again very disappointing. A route alongside the A4138 Llanelli to Llangennech has been built below the ATA guidelines despite our efforts and pleading to improve the design. Much of what has been done in the way of Highway maintenance is clearly done without the awareness of the duties set out in the ATA. Significant planning applications (most notably 21<sup>st</sup> century schools) have been submitted without ANY reference to the ATA and in several cases these have not been picked up in the planning and highway liaison assessments.

c/ Action to improve the effectiveness of the Act- Planning Guidance and the requirement to consider the ATA at the same level as is needed for Habitat Directives is a MUST. To do so then Local Authority staff need to be trained and reminded of their duties under the ATA. We are aware that across the Carmarthenshire County Council only a handful of officers are even aware of its existence. As a Forum we have recently asked Welsh Water to provide a legacy from their £50m+ surface water scheme in Llanelli and they have declined. Is there a way in which Statutory Service providers include consideration of the ATA in their exit works within Public Highway land?

d/ Value for money - potentially it has the ability to deliver value for money IF Local Authorities were aware that within their Highway budgets they have a duty to consider walking and cycling. The INM's should give some focus and certainty in protecting key strategic urban routes and provide developer gain. In terms of the process up the INM consultation never sought to reach the 85%+ of non cyclists who we needed to reach and ask why they don't walk or cycle more regularly and what routes could alter their travel behaviour. On this most important of points the Act has failed miserably....!!

e/ Effectiveness of the Active Travel Action Plan – we have no detailed knowledge of this plan to be able to comment.

f/ Funding and capacity - we sign up to the minimum £10 per person per year being committed to walking and cycling . Until Welsh Government subscribe to this level of investment we will have the best of legislation and the worst of actual improvement and opportunity on the ground.

g/ Active Travel Board – we are conscious that this meets but very little information filters down to members of Sustrans, Welsh Cycling or Cycling UK. We very much hope there will be a synergy between the Board and the All Party Advisory Committee which we as a fully constituted group have the opportunity to attend and give evidence of real issues affecting the ability for all people to cycle or walk for functional journeys.

h/ Is Active Travel integrated in wider WG and LA policy – our own experience in Carmarthenshire is that they are not taking Active Travel seriously enough and indeed, their emerging Cycling Strategy gives undue priority to elite cycling! A recent Corporate Strategy had no reference to the ATA. As stated above, Welsh Government need to integrate Planning Policy and insist on assessment and protection for walkers and cyclists within development proposals as strong as that for bats, reptiles and butterflies!