

Complete Agenda



**Cyd-Bwyllgor Corfforedig
Gogledd Cymru
North Wales
Corporate Joint Committee**



Mae'r ddogfen hon hefyd ar gael yn Gymraeg.

This document is also available in Welsh.

Meeting

NORTH WALES CJC STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE

Date and Time

2.00 pm, MONDAY, 23RD MARCH, 2026

Location

Virtual Meeting

(For public access to the meeting, please contact us)

Contact Point

Sera Jane Whitley

serajanewhitley@gwynedd.llyw.cymru

NORTH WALES CJC STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE

Voting Members

Councillors

Ieuan Williams
Craig ab Iago
Mike Priestley
Barry Mellor
Glyn Banks
David Bithell

Isle of Anglesey County Council
Cyngor Gwynedd
Conwy County Borough Council
Denbighshire County Council
Flintshire County Council
Wrexham County Borough Council

Co-optee Members – Non Voting

Angela Jones
Henry Bradshaw

Eryri National Park
Transport For Wales

Constituent Council Link Officers

Huw Percy
Dafydd Wyn Williams
Geraint Edwards
Emlyn Jones
Katie Wilby
Darren Williams

Isle of Anglesey County Council
Cyngor Gwynedd
Conwy County Borough Council
Denbighshire County Council
Flintshire County Council
Wrexham County Borough Council

Officers in Attendance

Alwen Williams
Mark Watkins
Claire Incedon
Dewi Morgan
David Hole

Chief Executive of the Corporate Joint Committee
Monitoring Officer
Deputy Monitoring Officer
Chief Finance Officer
Corporate Joint Committee

A G E N D A

1. APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

To receive any declarations of personal interest.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

To note any items that are a matter of urgency in the view of the Chair for consideration.

4. MINUTES

4 - 7

The Chair shall propose that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2025 be signed as a true record.

5. PRESENTATION: T-NETWORK ADVISORY PANEL

Transport for Wales to present.

6. PRESENTATION: BUS FRANCHISING

Transport for Wales to present.

7. THE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE BI-ANNUAL REPORT 8 - 26

Alwen Williams, Chief Executive and Adam Graham, Senior Transport Officer to present the report.

8. CO-OPTION ONTO THE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE 27 - 28

Claire Incedon, Deputy Monitoring Officer (Interim) to present the report.

NORTH WALES CJC STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE 15/12/2025

Present: Councillor David Bithell (Wrexham County Borough Council) (Chair).

Councillors:

Ieuan Williams (Isle of Anglesey County Council), Craig ab Iago (Cyngor Gwynedd), Mike Priestley (Conwy County Borough Council), Barry Mellor (Denbighshire County Council), and Glyn Banks (Flintshire County Council).

Co-opted Members (Non-voting):

Keira Sweeney (Eryri National Park) and Henry Bradshaw (Transport for Wales).

Constituent Councils' Liaison Officers:

Huw Percy (Isle of Anglesey County Council), Gerwyn Jones (Cyngor Gwynedd), Geraint Edwards (Conwy County Borough Council), Mike Jones (Denbighshire County Council), Katie Wilby (Flintshire County Council) and Darren Williams and Gwen Thomas (Wrexham County Borough Council).

Officers present:

Claire Incedon (Deputy Monitoring Officer), David Hole (Corporate Joint Committee (CJC) Operational Programme Manager), Adam Graham (Senior Transport Officer - North Wales CJC), and Sera Whitley (Democracy Services Officer).

Others present:

Allan Pitt (ARUP), Lee Robinson (Transport for Wales), Anthony McKenna (North Wales Network), and Ben George (Transport for Wales).

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:-

- Angela Jones (Eryri National Park) with Keira Sweeney deputising
- Emlyn Jones (Denbighshire Council) with Mike Jones deputising
- Iwan Evans (Monitoring Officer)

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

There were no declarations of personal interest.

3. URGENT ITEMS

No urgent matters were raised.

4. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 October 2025 as a true record.

5. PRESENTATION: BUS FRANCHISING

An update on bus franchising was presented by Lee Robinson (Transport for Wales).

6. PRESENTATION: NORTH WALES NETWORK

An update on the North Wales Network was presented by Anthony McKenna (North Wales Network).

7. PRESENTATION: NORTH WALES NETWORK

It was decided to defer the update on the North Wales Network by Transport for Wales.

8. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE

The report was presented by Claire Incedon, (interim) Deputy Monitoring Officer.

RESOLVED

To recommend the following changes to the Terms of Reference for the CJC:

- **That the requirement to produce a quarterly progress report be replaced with reports every six months.**
- **That the sub-committee has the delegated power to consider and make recommendations to the CJC on regional transport funding and plan commitments.**

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The sub-committee will review its Terms of Reference annually and may recommend any amendments to the CJC. Any amendment to these terms must be approved by the CJC. The Sub-committee must implement those rules and procedures as adopted by the CJC and set out in the Terms of Reference - these were the powers delegated to the Sub-committee.

DISCUSSION

It was highlighted that the terms of reference stated that the Sub-Committee must review its terms of reference annually, and that any amendments must be recommended to, and approved by, the Corporate Joint Committee.

It was explained that the terms of reference included powers delegated to the Sub-Committee, and that the Sub-Committee must apply those rules and procedures as adopted in their terms of reference.

The context was provided for the first recommendation. It was noted that the strategic nature of the Sub-Committee's role was to review and make recommendations on policy development on a regional basis. To monitor this progress, the Sub-Committee provided performance and management reports to the CJC in the form of quarterly reports, which included regular updates on resource management and policy development.

It was explained that officers were of the view that the requirement to produce a quarterly report under the current terms of reference created a great deal of work within a short period of time, and therefore felt that it undermined its purpose as the Sub-Committee only met quarterly. Members were asked to consider the option to revise the terms of reference, where they adopted six-month reporting as a more sustainable way of reporting on performance and progress to the CJC.

It was explained that the second recommendation related to the recent delivery of the Regional Transport Plan, which included new ways of working through the modernisation of grants. It was noted that the Regional Transport Fund supported the development of the programme of plans to deliver the Regional Transport Delivery Plan by prioritising plans and grant funding.

Furthermore, it was explained that the current role of the Sub-Committee was to make recommendations on Regional Transport plans and policies. It was highlighted that the work of the Sub-Committee during the first transitional year of grant programming had shown a gap in the functions of the Sub-Committee. It was explained that while the Sub-Committee Members were involved in the process of prioritising schemes and allocating grants, the Sub-Committee had no powers to make recommendations to the Corporate Joint Committee. Members were asked to consider amending the terms of reference to include the power to make recommendations to the CJC on funding and scheme commitments.

The officers were thanked for their work, and the importance of revising the terms of reference was highlighted so that the Sub-Committee could make recommendations to the CJC. It was noted that any recommendations would have to be reported and approved by the CJC at the meeting on 23 January.

9. STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE ANNUAL SELF-ASSESSMENT REVIEW

The report was presented by Claire Incedon, Deputy Monitoring Officer (interim).

RESOLVED

To report on any conclusions and recommendations deriving from the self-assessment to the CJC.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Terms of Reference provides that the sub-committee will undertake an annual self-assessment of its activities. As part of the assessment, it will consider whether it receives sufficient and appropriate support to fulfil its role and whether its annual work plan is manageable or not.

DISCUSSION

Members were reminded that the work of the Sub-Committee had commenced in October 2024 and since then extensive work had been carried out including the review of the Regional Transport Plan, the Regional Transport Delivery plan, and related policy approval documents.

It was elaborated that, alongside its work, the Sub-Committee had benefited from face-to-face networking events and informal sessions with updates and presentations on national and regional transport initiatives and proposals.

Members were reminded that the membership of the Sub-Committee consisted of executive officers from each local authority, and that there had been many changes in the membership of the Sub-Committee in the last year.

It was noted that the Sub-Committee was required to complete an annual self-assessment of its activities, and as part of this work, Members were asked to consider whether they had received appropriate and adequate support to carry out their role, and whether the Sub-Committee's annual work plan was viable. It was highlighted that this had been an opportunity to assess the activities of the Sub-Committee in particular. Members were thanked for their engagement.

It was further noted that the questionnaire asked about the work of the Sub-Committee, and whether Members felt they were being supported from the point of being co-opted to their time and work on the Sub-Committee. It was reported that feedback from Members was positive, and that the Sub-Committee was properly fulfilling its role with the forward work plan, agendas, and sharing information.

The officers were thanked for their time preparing the report.

10. REGIONAL TRANSPORT PLAN - COMMITMENTS REGISTER

The report was presented by Adam Graham, Senior Transport Officer.

RESOLVED

To note the Commitments Register and the covering report.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Terms of Reference provides that the sub-committee will undertake an annual self-assessment of its activities. As part of the assessment, it will consider whether it receives sufficient and appropriate support to fulfil its role and whether its annual work plan is manageable or not.

DISCUSSION

It was highlighted that the Regional Transport Plan covered a broad scope of policies, and was supported by the Regional Transport Delivery Plan.

It was explained that some policies and aspirations did not fit within the remit that local authorities were developing through the Regional Transport Delivery Plan, and that these would be provided as an update to members. It was added that matters such as how Ambition North Wales worked with the Welsh Government on strategic road networks and policies, and other projects such as the Hydrogen Centre in Holyhead, were included. It was noted that the aim was for this document to be a live document that will be updated regularly.

It was agreed that regular updates would be provided to the Sub-Committee every six months.

The meeting commenced at 14:00 and concluded at 15:30.

Chair

**REPORT TO THE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE
23 March, 2026**

TITLE: The Strategic Transport Sub-Committee Bi-Annual Report

AUTHOR: Alwen Williams, Chief Executive
Adam Graham, Senior Transport Officer

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1. To consider the bi-annual report as required further to the Terms of Reference.

2. DECISION SOUGHT

2.1. To consider the report and make recommendations if necessary to the Corporate Joint Committee.

3. REASON FOR THE DECISION

3.1. The Terms of Reference for the Sub Committee require that an update report is produced on a bi-annual basis.

4. BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS

4.1. The Terms of Reference state that the “Strategic Transport Sub-Committee will prepare a bi-annual report on its work for the Corporate Joint Committee.

4.2. The context for such a report is to ensure that the work of the Sub-Committee is open and transparent and that its functions are being clearly communicated.

4.3. The Terms of Reference provide that bi-annual reports shall form part of an agreed scrutiny protocol and shall be in a format which will facilitate its submission into Scrutiny or other governance arrangements as determined by the Corporate Joint Committee.

5. BI-ANNUAL REPORT

5.1. Approval of RTP

5.1.1 On 30th June 2025 the Strategic Transport Sub-Committee recommended that the CJC approve the RTP and its supporting documents for submission to the Welsh Government for Ministerial approval and publication.

5.1.2 On the 18th July, 2025 the CJC made the decision to approve the North Wales Regional Transport Plan and supporting documentation for submission to the Welsh Government for approval and publication by the Minister in September 2025.

5.1.3 On the 30th September 2025, the Cabinet Secretary for Transport and North Wales wrote to the Chair of the CJC and the Chief Executive of Ambition North Wales to inform that the RTP had been approved and was in effect from the date of approval, 25/09/2025.

5.2 Regional Transport Fund Programme of Schemes

5.2.1 From the start of the 2026/7 financial year, Welsh Government's Regional Transport Fund is expected to be an important source of funding for the transport interventions identified in the Regional Transport Delivery Plan (RTDP).

5.2.2 Ambition North Wales, supported by external consultants, have worked closely with officers from local authorities to identify a Programme of Schemes for funding in 2026/7. This is reflective of the RTDP prioritised schemes, local authority aspirations, and the indicative budget provided by Welsh Government. A draft programme was presented to the Sub-Committee and then approved by CJC in October.

5.2.3 Welsh Government reviewed the draft programme and sent comments back to Ambition North Wales in December. Working closely with local authority officers again, the comments raised by Welsh Government were addressed and revised documents were re-submitted to Welsh Government in line with a late January deadline. At the time of writing this report, we are awaiting approval of the programme from Welsh Government.

5.2.4 Once approved by Welsh Government, the schemes proposed in the Programme of Schemes will commence delivery in the next financial year. Schemes will be delivered by the local authorities in North Wales. For 2026/27, the funding for the schemes will go directly from Welsh Government to the local authorities. The CJC's role in monitoring progress of delivery in the next financial year will be determined by Welsh Government guidance that is yet to be finalised.

5.3 Responses Sent to Consultation Run by Partner Organisations

5.3.1 In the last six months, two responses have been sent to consultations run by partner organisations.

5.3.2 Welsh Government and Transport for Wales were consulting on revisions to the Active Travel Act Guidance. Informed by comments from local authority officers who work with the guidance, the technical nature of the response meant that it was sent in the name of the Ambition North Wales Chief Executive. The response is included in Appendix 1.

5.3.3 The Liverpool City Region Combined Authority consulted on the Delivery Plan for their Local Transport Plan. Our response, focussed on the importance of cross-border movement and ongoing partnership working, was sent in the name of the Chair of the Sub-Committee. The response is included in Appendix 2.

6. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

6.1 The CJC secured funding of £200k from Welsh Government for RTP and RTDP progression in financial year 2025/26. As we approach the end of the financial year, the funding claim that will be returned to Welsh Government will show full spend of that £200k

6.2. Financial spend from that funding has been used to cover consultancy support to continue the commission with Arup that has provided technical support and delivery with finalising the RTP

and RTDP, and the coordination of the Regional Transport Fund Programme of Schemes. The spend also covers officer time for those CJC officers who have worked on RTP development.

- 6.3 Ambition North Wales buys-in support from Cyngor Gwynedd.. This provides officer time for support on Legal services, Democratic Services, and finance support.
- 6.4 For next financial year, in Welsh Government Guidance, the CJC can claim up to 3% of the annual Regional Transport Fund budget (estimated £849,000) for project management costs. The same guidance notes that £100,000 revenue grant is available to the CJC from Welsh Government for 2026/27.
- 6.5 Through the development of the Programme of Schemes, it was identified that a CJC allocation of £350,000 – or 1.27% of the total capital could be secured without impacting on scheme spending. Added to the £100k revenue available, it means that the CJC's budget for programme management will be £450k for 2026/27. This was included in the figures sent to Welsh Government for the proposed RTF Programme of Schemes.

7. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

- 7.1 The CJC will have an increasing role in managing the programme and spend of transport scheme delivery in 2026/27, and this will have an impact on the staff resources required. The £450k budget noted in paragraph 6.5 includes allowance for the recruitment of up to two Transport Officers (job titles to be confirmed) who will work with the Senior Transport Officer to manage the programme.

8. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. There are no direct financial implications arising out of this report.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. The legal and governance implications are addressed in the body of the report.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Response to Active Travel Act Guidance consultation

Appendix 2 – Response to Liverpool City Region RTP Delivery Plan consultation

STATUTORY OFFICERS RESPONSE:

i. Monitoring Officer:

The report is presented in accordance with the Terms of Reference which require the Strategic Transport Sub-Committee to report bi-annually to the Corporate Joint Committee on its activities. The report is primarily for information and transparency in relation to the work undertaken by the Sub-Committee. No specific legal issues arise from the recommendations sought.

ii. **Statutory Finance Officer:**

I am satisfied with the accuracy of the financial information contained within the report and the decision sought does not create a new spending commitment.

Drwy e-bost: engageatag@tfw.wales

Dyddiad / Date: 12/02/2026

Annwyl TrCI,

YMATEB I'R YMGYNGHORIAD AR GANLLAWIAU DRAFFT Y DDEDDF TEITHIO LLESOL

Diolch am y cyfle i gymryd rhan yn yr ymgynghoriad ar y diweddariad i Ganllawiau drafft y Ddeddf Teithio Llesol.

Dyma'r ymateb gan Gyd-Bwyllgor Corfforedig y Gogledd, a'r bwriad yw nodi polisiau a dyheadau ein Cynllun Trafnidiaeth Rhanbarthol, a'r rôl allweddol y gwelwn ni y mae cerdded, beicio a symud ar olwynion/olwyno yn ei chwarae o safbwynt cefnogi ein gweledigaeth.

Rydym wedi rhoi sylw i'r cwestiynau allweddol o'r ddogfen ymgynghori isod.

Cwestiwn 1 - Llwybrau cyd-ddefnyddio

A) Mae Elfennau Dylunio DE401, DE403 a DE504 yn cyflwyno coeden penderfyniadau i gefnogi'r asesiad o arwyneb yr ardal cyd-ddefnyddio i fod yn briodol ar gyfer yr amgylchiadau lleol. Bwriad hyn yw lleihau achosion o gamddefnyddio llwybrau cyd-ddefnyddio.. Ydych chi'n gweld hyn yn ddefnyddiol?

- *Ydw*

Mae'r goeden benderfyniadau yn ddefnyddiol gan ei bod yn nodi'n glir pa newidynnau y dylid eu hystyried wrth ystyried llwybr cyd-ddefnyddio. Fodd bynnag, byddai'n fwy defnyddiol pe bai ffactorau eraill - y dylid eu hystyried - yn cael eu nodi yn y goeden benderfyniadau, megis:

- A yw'r lled sydd ar gael yn dderbyniol?
- Beth yw'r galw am feicio?

Byddai'n ddefnyddiol hefyd pe bai mwy o opsiynau yn cael eu hystyried lle nad yw llwybr cyd-ddefnyddio yn briodol. Gallai'r rhain gynnwys mesurau lleihau traffig, llwybrau tawelach cyfochrog ac ati.

O ran DE504 yn benodol, dylai'r goeden benderfyniadau ystyried defnydd o safleoedd bysiau arferol, ac yn y dyfodol, yn y lleoliad. Bydd hyn yn helpu i fesur niferoedd tebygol sy'n aros yn y safle, ac i ddeall hefyd pa mor aml y bydd bysiau yn codi/gollwng teithwyr. Er bod hyn yn cael ei nodi yn 11.31.10, mae'n ystyriaeth bwysig yma hefyd.

Byddai'n ddefnyddiol hefyd deall ar beth mae'r lled absoliwt lleiaf yn seiliedig i ddangos yr hyn sydd eisoes wedi'i ystyried yn y cyd-destun hwn, ac eraill lle mae'r lled absoliwt lleiaf ar waith. E.e. ai 2.7m yw lled cadair olwyn safonol a beic gyda gofod o 100mm rhyngddynt neu newidynnau eraill?

B) Mae Tabl 11.5 diwygiedig (t.178) yn cynghori dylunwyr i ddarparu mwy o led os oes rhwng 100 a 200 o feicwyr yr awr yn ei ddefnyddio. Mae'n awgrymu gwahanu'n llwyr ar gyfer sefyllfaoedd lle disgwylir bod mwy na 300 o bobl yn beicio bob awr. Bwriad hyn yw gwella profiad y defnyddiwr ar lwybrau cyd-ddefnyddio. Ydych chi'n meddwl y bydd yn effeithiol?

- *Ydw*

Bydd - bydd y safonau hyn yn gwella'r profiad i ddefnyddwyr yn y lleoliadau hynny lle mae llwybr cyd-ddefnyddio yn ymyrraeth addas a bod digon o led i ddarparu cyfleuster i'r safonau hynny. Fodd bynnag, mewn rhai achosion bydd y safonau hyn yn arwain at fethu gwneud gwelliannau oherwydd diffyg tir sydd ar gael neu gostau uwch. Yn yr achosion hynny, ni fydd unrhyw fudd i bobl sydd eisiau cerdded neu symud ar olwynion ar gyfer eu taith.

Dylid ystyried yma hefyd y rhwydwaith beicio lleol ehangach ac o bosibl hyd yn oed cerdded a symud ar olwynion hefyd. E.e. gall niferoedd beicio fod yn uchel oherwydd diffyg llwybrau eraill yn yr ardal. Mewn rhai achosion, gall y ddaearyddiaeth olygu mai dyma'r unig aliniad posibl. Fodd bynnag, mewn ardaloedd adeiledig lle mae niferoedd uchel fel hyn yn fwyaf tebygol, efallai y byddai opsiynau i wella llwybrau cyfochrog i wella'r dewis o lwybrau a lleihau llif beiciau ar unrhyw un aliniad penodol.

Hefyd, a yw'r ffigurau yn nhabl 11.5 yn absoliwt neu a all fod unrhyw hyblygrwydd mewn rhai amgylchiadau? E.e. os yw llwybr yn gweld 115 o ddefnyddwyr beicio y dydd yn rheolaidd a bod lle yn gyfyngedig, a allai fod rhywfaint o hyblygrwydd o fewn lefel y goddefiant a nodir?

Cwestiwn 2 - Dulliau cyfunol o drin mynedfeydd i ffyrdd ymyl

Mae Elfen Ddylunio 605 ac Adranau 12.5.15 - 12.5.17 wedi'u diweddarau, ac maen nhw bellach yn cynnwys palmant botymog. Bwriedir y newidiadau arfaethedig i ddulliau cyfunol o drin mynedfeydd i ffyrdd ymyl ochr gael effaith gadarnhaol ar hygyrchedd a phrofiad y defnyddiwr, o'i gymharu â chanllawiau blaenorol 2021. Ydych chi'n cefnogi'r newidiadau hyn?

- *Ydw*

Bydd y newidiadau hyn o fudd i bobl sy'n cerdded, symud ar olwynion a beicio ar hyd coridorau lle gellir cyflwyno triniaeth o'r fath ar y coridor i gyd. Bydd ychwanegu gofyniad ar gyfer palmant botymog yn gwella diogelwch i'r defnyddwyr hynny sy'n ddall neu â nam ar eu golwg ac sy'n aml yn fwyaf agored i niwed lle mae newidiadau i gynllun y ffordd yn ychwanegu rhywfaint o ansicrwydd i ddefnyddwyr.

Fodd bynnag, dylid ystyried y newidiadau mewn cyd-destun diogelwch ehangach. Yn bennaf, mae gweithredu'r cyffyrdd diwygiedig yn ddiogel ac yn effeithiol yn dibynnu ar ddealltwriaeth gyrrwyr a newid yn eu hymddygiad. Dylid ystyried effaith culhau'r gyffordd, lle gall hyn arwain at gerbydau hirach yn mynd ar y droedffordd, o safbwynt cerddwyr a'r rheini ar olwynion sy'n aros i groesi wrth y gyffordd.

Pan fo ochr y ffordd ar gyffordd yn rhan o lwybr bws, dylid hefyd ystyried yr effaith y dylai cyffyrdd cul ei chael ar fysiau sy'n symud.

Cwestiwn 3 - Parhad llwybr beiciau wrth safleoedd bysiau

A) Ydym wedi cynnwys canllawiau newydd ar alinio cyfleusterau beicio oddi wrth llwybrau bysiau lle bynnag y bo modd er mwyn lleihau nifer y lleoliadau lle bydd angen parhad llwybrau beicio wrth safleoedd bysiau. Ydych chi'n meddwl bod y newidiadau arfaethedig yn gwella canllawiau blaenorol 2021?

- *Ydw*

Bydd y newidiadau yn y canllawiau yn gwella diogelwch i ddefnyddwyr y priffyrdd sy'n fwy agored i niwed.

Dylid nodi, fodd bynnag, bod y prif lwybr llygad ar gyfer pob defnyddiwr ar y briffordd, yn aml yn dilyn yr un llwybr. Gall hyn ei gwneud hi'n anodd gwahanu beicwyr a bysiau oddi wrth ei gilydd heb wneud y bws na'r seilwaith beicio yn llai dymunol.

Lle mae'r llwybrau hyn yn arwain at ganol trefi, efallai mai lle cyfyngedig sydd yno ar gyfer dyluniad sy'n cydymffurfio'n llawn â'r canllawiau.

Dylid cadw'r cyfyngiadau hyn mewn cof wrth wneud penderfyniadau ynghylch ariannu a dylunio cynlluniau sy'n darparu buddion ehangach.

B) Rydym wedi diwygio adran 11.31 a DE502, 503 a 504 i helpu i leihau'r risg a difrifoldeb gwrthdrawiadau, lle mae angen parhad llwybrau beicio wrth safleoedd bysiau. Ydych chi'n cefnogi'r newidiadau hyn wrth eu cymharu â chanllawiau blaenorol 2021?

- *Ydw*

Gallai'r canllawiau fynd ymhellach hefyd ac ystyried mater trafnidiaeth ehangach yng nghydestun diogelwch wrth gerdded, beicio a symud ar olwynion. Gellid ystyried a ellid newid y llwybr bysiau, llwybr beicio neu lwybr traffig modur i ddarparu'n well ar gyfer beicio ar y ffordd.

C) Oes unrhyw drefniadau amgen eraill ar gyfer parhad llwybrau beicio wrth safleoedd bysiau y dylid eu hychwanegu at y canllawiau?

- *Dim Barn*

Nid oes unrhyw opsiynau ychwanegol yr ydym am eu cynnig ar hyn o bryd, ond dylai penderfyniadau a wneir yn y dyfodol ynghylch cyllido a dylunio ymyriadau gofio y gallai trefniadau amgen fod yn fwy addas ar gyfer lleoliadau yng ngogledd Cymru.

Os ystyrir unrhyw astudiaethau sy'n edrych ar y defnydd o lwybrau beicio mewn safleoedd bysiau, byddai gan ardaloedd yng ngogledd Cymru ddiddordeb mewn bod yn rhan o'r gwaith hwnnw. Yn Wrecsam, bydd llwybr AT Canol Dinas Ffordd yr Wyddgrug yn gosod un newydd.

Cwestiwn 4 - Dylunio gwybodaeth

A) Mae Ffigurau G1, G2 a G3 yn cyflwyno coeden penderfyniadau i gefnogi'r asesiad o arwyneb yr ardal cyd-ddefnyddio i fod yn briodol ar gyfer yr amgylchiadau lleol. Hoffech chi weld mwy o goed penderfyniadau ar gyfer themâu eraill y ddogfen mewn diwygiadau yn y dyfodol?

- *Hoffwn*

Mae'r coed penderfyniadau yn ddefnyddiol o ran helpu i nodi'r ffactorau y dylid eu hystyried wrth wneud penderfyniadau am ymyriadau Teithio Llesol. Fodd bynnag, fel y nodwyd yn ein hymateb i Gwestiwn 1A, dylai'r coed ystyried yr holl newidynnau sydd angen eu hystyried yn y broses o wneud penderfyniadau, a dylai'r canlyniad o ddilyn y goeden roi opsiynau amlwg ar gyfer y 'camau nesaf'.

B) Mae 'Tabl 11.1 Darpariaeth i feiciau ar lwybrau cyswllt' a 'Tabl 12.1 Croesfannau addas ar gyfer llif/cyflymder cerbydau' wedi'u diweddarau. Y bwriad yw gwella hygyrchedd, profiad y defnyddiwr a'r gallu i gyflawni mewn senarios byd go iawn. Ydych chi'n meddwl y bydd y newidiadau a gynigir yn cael effaith gadarnhaol ar y cyfan, wrth gymharu â chanllawiau blaenorol 2021?

- *Ydw*

Bydd y tablau yn helpu i sicrhau bod cyflymder yn cael ei ystyried yn briodol mewn penderfyniadau ynghylch seilwaith teithio llesol.

Byddai'n ddefnyddiol deall beth yw sail y gwahanol derfynau cyflymder/llif ac ati sydd yn y tabl. E.e. Os yw'r cyflymder 85 canradd yn 23mya, a ddylid diystyru lôn feiciau ar y ffordd gerbydau o angenrheidrwydd? Er gallai'r cynllun hefyd geisio lleihau'r cyflymder, ni fyddai'n amlwg pa mor effeithiol fyddai hynny hyd nes byddai gwaith ôl-fonitro yn digwydd.

C) Mae 'Tabl 9.9: Math o lwybr beiciau a'r isafswm lled dymunol/absoliwt' a Thabl 11.1: Darpariaeth i feiciau ar lwybrau cyswllt wedi'u diweddarau. Y bwriad yw gwella hygyrchedd, profiad y defnyddiwr a'r gallu i gyflawni mewn senarios byd go iawn. Ydych chi'n meddwl y bydd y newidiadau a gynigir i'r canllawiau hyn ar led llwybrau a darpariaeth i feiciau ar lwybrau cyswllt yn cael effaith cadarnhaol ar y cyfan, wrth gymharu â chanllawiau blaenorol 2021?

- *Ydw*

Mae'n amlwg mai bwriad y newidiadau yw cael effaith gadarnhaol ar gydbwysedd, a byddant yn cael yr effaith honno lle gall cynllun ddarparu ar gyfer gofynion y canllawiau.

Yr her yw sicrhau nad yw'r canllawiau yn dod yn rhwystr rhag datblygu cynlluniau neu welliannau a fydd yn rhoi budd enfawr i gymunedau, hyd yn oed os nad ydynt o reidrwydd yn cydymffurfio'n llawn â'r canllawiau.

Yn ein Cynllun Trafnidiaeth Rhanbarthol, rydym yn cydnabod y gall gwelliannau bach mewn seilwaith teithio llesol wneud gwahaniaeth sylweddol i wella'r cysylltiadau rhwng ein haneddiadau allweddol a'n pentrefi a'n cymunedau gwledig llai, lle gall trigolion gael mynediad yn haws at wasanaethau ac amwynderau hanfodol. Mae ein Polisi AT 4 yn nodi: "Mewn ardaloedd gwledig, bydd gwelliannau isadeiledd teithio llesol yn canolbwyntio ar fudd y gymuned o gynlluniau; gwella diogelwch a llwybrau sy'n cysylltu cymunedau llai gydag aneddiadau a gwasanaethau mwy."

- C) Diwygiwyd Atodiad H (archwiliadau llwybrau), a chyflwynwyd Atodiad L newydd, sef Log Penderfyniadau. Bwriad y diwygiadau hyn a'r Atodiad L newydd yw cefnogi pobl yn well i gynllunio, dylunio a defnyddio cynlluniau teithio llesol newydd. Ydych chi'n meddwl bod yr atodiadau hyn yn welliant wrth gymharu â chanllawiau blaenorol 2021?

- *Ydi*

Er bod gennym rai pryderon am natur hir y dull hwn, o bosib, a'r gofyn y bydd hyn yn ei roi ar adnoddau staff, rydym yn falch o weld bod y dull yn cael ei adolygu. Bydd yn gymorth i gael ffordd ffurfiol o gofnodi'r penderfyniad a wneir wrth gyflwyno llwybr neu welliant newydd.

Fel y nodwyd yn ein hymateb i Gwestiwn 4D, rydym wedi nodi yn ein Cynllun Trafnidiaeth Rhanbarthol y dylai budd cymunedol fod yn ystyriaeth wrth wneud penderfyniadau ar ymyriadau teithio llesol. Felly, hoffem weld hyn yn cael ei ystyried yn rhan o'r archwiliad, ac am weithredu'n bragmataidd ble mae blaenoriaethau lleol neu ranbarthol yn effeithio ar sgôr yr archwiliad.

Mae'r log penderfyniadau newydd yn rhoi cyfle i ddarparu mwy o wybodaeth i lywio'r dull gweithredu pragmataidd hwnnw.

Cwestiwn 5 - Cynhwysiant a hygyrchedd dogfennau

- A) Bwriad y diweddariadau a wnaed i'r ddogfen ganllaw pdf hon yw gwella hygyrchedd dogfennau i safon dderbyniol. Ydych chi'n fodlon bod hyn yn ddigonol?

- *Ydw*

Mae hygyrchedd dogfennau yn ystyriaeth ym mhob dogfen sy'n cael ei chynhyrchu, a dylai barhau i fod yn ystyriaeth. Mae hon yn ddogfen dechnegol sydd wedi'i hanelu at gynulleidfa benodol - byddai gofyn i bawb fod yn gyfarwydd â'r cysyniadau a'r eirfa ynddi. Fel y cyfryw, rydym yn gyfforddus bod hyn yn ddigonol.

- B) Un o'r prif ddiweddariadau i'r iaith a ddefnyddir yw'r eglurhad a roddir drwy gydol y ddogfen bod teithio llesol yn cynnwys cerdded, symud ar olwynion a beicio, ynghyd ag iaith fwy gynhwysol, gan ddylunio ar gyfer defnyddwyr amrywiol, a thynnu sylw at anghenion menywod, genethod a defnyddwyr ffyrdd sy'n agored i niwed.

Ydych chi'n cytuno bod y diweddariadau hyn yn cefnogi cyfranogiad cynhwysol mewn cerdded, olwyno a beicio?

- *Ydw*

Cwestiwn 6 - Creu lleoedd

Ar gyfer y canllawiau diweddaraf hyn rydym wedi cynnwys pennod newydd ar greu lleoedd; Pennod 8. A yw hyn yn bodloni eich disgwyliadau a'ch gofynion i'r canllawiau hyn alluogi'r datblygu a chyflawni o gynlluniau o ansawdd uchel sy'n bodloni nifer o amcanion creu lleoedd?

- *Ydi*

Mae'n braf gweld bod Creu Lleoedd wedi'i gynnwys yn y canllawiau. Mae trafndiaeth yn allweddol i sut mae lle yn edrych, yn teimlo ac yn gweithredu - nawr ac yn y dyfodol. Felly dylid ystyried trafndiaeth a lle gyda'i gilydd. Er mwyn cyflawni hynny'n llwyddiannus, fodd bynnag, mae'n hanfodol bod ffrydiau ariannu, fel y Gronfa Drafndiaeth Ranbarthol, yn cydnabod pwysigrwydd y cysylltiad rhyngddynt ac nad yw cyllid yn aros mewn seilo ar gyfer yr elfennau trafndiaeth penodol mewn cynlluniau ehangach.

Yn gywir,

Alwen Williams

Alwen Williams
Prif Weithredwr

By e-mail to: engageatag@tfw.wales

Dyddiad / Date: 12/02/2025

Dear TfW ,

RESPONSE TO DRAFT ACTIVE TRAVEL ACT GUIDANCE CONSULTATION

Thank you for the opportunity to take part in the consultation on the draft updated Active Travel Act Guidance.

This is the response from the North Wales CJC, and is intended to reflect the policies and ambitions of our Regional Transport Plan, and the key role that we recognise that walking, cycling and wheeling play in supporting our vision.

We have addressed each of the key questions from the consultation document below.

Question 1 – Shared use paths

A) Design Elements DE401 (p.436), DE403 (p.442) and DE504 (p. 454) introduce a decision tree to support the assessment of shared use surfaces being appropriate for the local circumstances. This is intended to reduce instances of the incorrect use of shared use paths. Do you find this helpful??

- Yes

The decision tree is helpful as it makes it clear which variables should be considered when considering a shared use path. However, it could be made more helpful if other factors that should be considered could be captured in the decision tree, such as:

- Is the available width acceptable?
- What is the demand for cycling.

It would also be useful if more options were considered where a shared use path is not appropriate. These could include traffic reduction measures, parallel quieter routes etc.

Regarding DE504 specifically, the decision tree should consider typical and future bus stop use at the location. This will help gauge likely numbers waiting at the stop,

as well as understanding how often buses will pick-up/drop passengers. Whilst this is noted in 11.31.10, it is also an important consideration here.

It would also be useful to understand what the absolute minimum is based on to show what has already been considered in this context, and others where the absolute minimum is in place. E.g. is 2.7m the width of a standard wheelchair and cycle with a space of 100mm between or other variables?

B) A revised Table 11.5 (p.178) guides designers to provide greater widths where numbers of people cycling is between 100 and 200 per hour. It suggests full separation for situations where more than 300 people cycling per hour are expected. This is intended to improve the user experience on shared use paths. Do you think will be effective?

- *Yes*

Yes, these standards will improve the user experience at those locations where a shared use path is a suitable intervention and there is a sufficient width to provide a facility to those standards. However, in some instances these standards will result in improvements becoming undeliverable due to lack of available land or increased costs. In those instances, there will be no benefit for people wanting to walk or wheel for their journey.

There should also be consideration here of the wider local cycling network and possibly even walking and wheeling too. E.g. cycling numbers may be high due to a lack of other routes in the area. In some cases the geography may mean this is the only alignment possible. However, in built-up areas where such high numbers are most likely, it may be the case that there would be options to improve parallel routes to improve route choice and reduce the flow of cycles on any one particular alignment.

Also, are the figures in table 11.5 absolute or is there can be any flex in some circumstances. E.g. if a route regularly sees 115 cycle users per day and space is limited could there be some flexibility within an identified tolerance?

Question 2 – Blended side road entry treatments

Design Element 605 (p.471) and Sections 12.5.15 – 12.5.17 (p.210-211) have been updated and now include tactile paving. The changes proposed to blended side road entry treatments are intended to have a positive impact on accessibility and user experience, compared to the previous 2021 guidance. Do you support these changes?

- *Yes*

These changes will benefit people walking, wheeling and cycling along corridors where such treatment can be introduced on a corridor-wide basis. The addition of a requirement for tactile paving will increase safety for those users who are blind or

visually impaired and who are often most vulnerable where changes to road layout add some uncertainty for users.

However, the changes should be considered in the wider safety context. Notably, the safe and effective operation of the revised junctions relies on an understanding by drivers and a change in their behaviour. The impact of narrowing the junction, where this may result in longer vehicles mounting the footway, should be considered in the context of walkers and wheelers waiting to cross at the junction.

Where the affected side road junction is part of a bus route, the impact that narrowed junctions should have on bus movement should also be considered.

Question 3 – Cycle track continuity at bus stops

A) We have included new guidance on aligning cycle facilities away from bus routes wherever possible to reduce the number of locations where cycle track continuation at bus stops will be required. Do you think that the proposed changes are an improvement on the previous 2021 guidance?

- *Yes*

The changes made to the guidance will increase safety for more vulnerable highway users.

It should be noted, however, that the main desire line for all highway users, often follow the same route. This can make it difficult to separate cyclists and buses from each other without making either the bus or the cycle infrastructure less desirable.

Where these routes are on the approach to town centres there can also be limited space to accommodate a design that is fully compliant with the guidance.

These restrictions should be borne in mind when decisions are made about funding and designing schemes that provide wider benefits.

B) We have made amendments to section 11.31(p.189) and DE502, 503 and 504 to help reduce the risk and severity of collisions, where cycle track continuation at bus stops is required. Do you support these changes compared to the previous 2021 guidance?

- *Yes*

The guidance could also go further and consider wider transport issue in the context of walking, cycling and wheeling safety. Consideration could be given to whether the bus routing, cycle way routing or motor traffic routing could be changed to better accommodate on-road cycling.

C) Are there any other alternative arrangements for cycle track continuity at bus stops that should be added to the guidance?

- *No Opinion*

There are no additional options that we wish to put forward at this stage, but future decisions about funding and design of interventions should bear in mind that alternative arrangements may be more suitable for locations in North Wales.

If any studies considering the use of cycle tracks at bus stops are being considered, areas of North Wales would be interested in being part of that work. In Wrexham, the Mold Road City Centre AT route will have a new one installed.

Question 4 - Information design

- A) **Figures G1, G2 and G3 introduce a decision tree to support the assessment of shared use surfaces being appropriate for the local circumstances. Would you like to see more decision trees for other themes of the document in future revisions?**

- *Yes*

The decisions trees are useful in helping set out the factors that should be considered when making decisions about Active Travel interventions. However, as noted in our response to Question 1A, the trees should consider all variables that need to be considered in the decision making process, and the outcome of following the tree should provide clear options for 'next steps'.

- B) **'Table 11.1 Cycle provision on links' (p.162) and 'Table 12.1 Suitable crossings for speed/vehicle flows' (p.207) have been updated. The intention is to improve accessibility, user experience and deliverability in real world scenarios. Do think that the changes proposed will on balance have a positive impact, compared to the previous 2021 guidance?**

- *Yes*

The tables will help make sure that speed is appropriately considered in decisions regarding active travel infrastructure.

It would be helpful to understand the basis of the different cut-off speeds/flows etc. shown in the table. E.g. If the 85th percentile is 23mph, should an on-carriageway cycle lane necessarily be dismissed? Whilst the scheme could also seek to reduce the speed, the effectiveness of that would not be known until post-delivery monitoring is undertaken.

- C) **'Table 9.9: Cycle route type and desirable/absolute minimum widths' (p.130) and Table 11.1: Cycle provision on links (p.161) have been updated. The intention is to improve accessibility, user experience and deliverability in real world scenarios. Do think that the changes proposed on path widths and cycle link provision will on balance have a positive impact, compared to the previous 2021 guidance?**

- *Yes*

The changes are clearly intended to have a positive impact on balance, and they will have that impact where a scheme can accommodate the requirements of the guidance.

The challenge is to ensure that the guidance does not become a barrier to developing schemes or improvements that will provide a huge benefit to communities even if they are not necessarily fully compliant with the guidance,

In our RTP we acknowledge that small improvements to active travel infrastructure can make a significant difference to improving links between our key settlements and our villages and smaller rural communities, where residents can more easily access essential services and amenities. Our Policy AT4 states that “In rural areas, active travel infrastructure improvements will focus on the community benefit of schemes; improving safety and routes that connect smaller communities with larger settlements and services.”

D) Appendix H (route audits) was revised, and a new Appendix L, Decision Log, was introduced. These revisions and the new Appendix L are intended to better support people planning, designing and using new active travel schemes. Do you think that these appendices are an improvement compared to the previous 2021 guidance?

- Yes

Although we have some concerns about the possibly lengthy nature of this approach and the requirement this will place on staff resources, we are pleased to see the approach being reviewed. It will be helpful to have a formalised way of capturing the decision made in bringing about a new route or improvement.

As noted in our response to Question 4D, we have stated in our RTP that community benefit should be a consideration in decision making on active travel interventions. We would therefore like to see this as a consideration as part of the audit, and for a pragmatic approach to be taken where local or regional priorities impact on the audit scoring.

The new decision log provides the opportunity to provide more information to inform that pragmatic approach.

Question 5 - Document accessibility and inclusion

A) The updates made to this guidance pdf document are intended to improve document accessibility to an acceptable standard. Are you satisfied that this is sufficient

- Yes

Document accessibility is and should continue to be a consideration in all documents that are produced. This is a technical document aimed at a specific audience who

would all be required to be familiar with the concepts and terminology it includes. As such, we are comfortable that this is sufficient.

- B) One of the key updates to the language used is clarifying throughout the document that active travel includes walking, wheeling, and cycling, along with more inclusive language, designing for diverse users, and highlighting the needs of women, girls, and vulnerable road users.

Do you agree that these updates support inclusive participation in walking, wheeling and cycling?

- Yes

Question 6 – Placemaking

For this updated guidance we have included a new chapter on placemaking; Chapter 8 (p.85-101) Does this meet your expectations and requirements for this guidance to enable the development and delivery of high-quality schemes meeting multiple placemaking objectives?

- Yes

It is pleasing to see Placemaking included in the guidance. Transport is key to how a place looks, feels and functions both now, and in the future. So transport and place should be considered together. To deliver on that successfully, though, it is crucial that funding streams, such as the Regional Transport Fund, recognise the importance of their interconnectivity and that funding does not remain in silos for the purely transport elements of wider schemes.

Yours sincerely,

Alwen Williams

Alwen Williams
Chief Executive

By e-mail

To TransportPolicy@liverpoolcityregion-ca.gov.uk

Dyddiad / Date: February 2026

Dear Transport Policy Team,

NORTH WALES CORPORATE JOINT COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO LIVERPOOL CITY REGION LTP CONSULTATION

Thank you for the opportunity for the North Wales Corporate Joint Committee (CJC) to comment on the Liverpool City Region (LCR) Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) and its Delivery Plan. The CJC has statutory responsibility for strategic transport planning in North Wales and is comprised of the six local authorities in the North Wales Region.

Cross-Border Movement

It is pleasing that the LTP and the Delivery Plan look beyond the boundaries of the City Region and recognise the importance of movement of people and goods into neighbouring areas, including North Wales. There are strong links between the communities and economies of northwest England and northeast Wales. These links are both cultural and economic and are most notably reflected in a large number of trips across the border each day, particularly at peak times when a large number of people travel for work.

There are a number of significant employment sites on both sides of the border, including Deeside Industrial Park, Wrexham and Chester city centres, Airbus Broughton, Chester Business Park, and Wrexham Industrial Estate. Reducing the number of people that commute to these locations by car will have obvious environmental impacts, but also reduce the impact of congestion on longer distance trips on the highway network.

Enhancing sustainable travel links to these sites for North Wales residents, and residents of England who work in North Wales will require partnership working between organisations in north Wales, and partners in England, including the Liverpool City Region. We are therefore very supportive of the inclusion of the following paragraph in the LTP:

“The LCRCA will work with closely bodies such as the Mersey-Dee Alliance, Transport for Wales, especially on the Network North Wales plans, with Welsh Government, The Great North partnership and adjoining Northern local authorities and Combined Authority areas to deliver joined-up, sustainable travel options across our borders. This will include not only the co-development of cross boundary schemes and enhancements, but also simplified ticketing and travel payment systems.”

The North Wales CJC will also be an important part of that partnership arrangement as the organisation with responsibility for strategic transport planning in North Wales.

It is also encouraging to see specific reference to Network North Wales in the above paragraph. This is a programme that, with effective partnership working, has the potential to transform public transport in parts of North Wales and beyond, particularly for communities and businesses on the Wrexham to Liverpool Line.

Network North Wales

The CJC is supportive of Welsh Government's Network North Wales proposals and is working with Transport for Wales and other partners to ensure that that programme complements the work that we are doing through our Regional Transport Plan. Liverpool City Region's support and involvement in the development of the Network North Wales programme is welcomed.

It is therefore pleasing to see that the Network North Wales proposal for enhanced service levels on the Wrexham-Liverpool Line are included in the Imminent Delivery Priorities of the LTP Delivery Plan, and wider Network North Wales ambitions included in the Future Vision.

As a CJC we have not identified a preference of operator for services on the Wrexham to Liverpool line. Whether services are TfW or Merseyrail, our aspirations for the Wrexham to Liverpool line are:

- a service level of up to four trains per hour
- shorter journey times could
- a direct link from Wrexham and North East Wales to Liverpool
- improved connections with the North Wales Main Line at Shotton
- improve access to Deeside Industrial Park

Vision, and Goals of LTP4

We are supportive of the proposed vision of "Clean, safe and accessible transport for moving people and goods" and the five goals of the draft plan, which are:

- Goal 1: Support good, clean job growth and opportunity for all
- Goal 2: Achieve net-zero carbon and an improved environment
- Goal 3: Improve health and quality of life
- Goal 4: Transport that's well maintained and tough
- Goal 5: Plan and respond to uncertainty and change and be innovative

The vision and goals are in line with our vision for transport in North Wales that is set out in our Regional Transport Plan: "North Wales will have a safe, sustainable, affordable, resilient, and effective integrated transport network that supports economic growth, prosperity for all, inclusivity and well-being."

Our vision is supported by four SMART objectives:

- Improve digital connectivity and local services
- Improved accessibility and transport choice
- Enable sustainable economic growth
- Enable decarbonisation through transition to a zero-emission fleet

Principles of LTP4

We are broadly supportive of all of the principles outlined in the Plan, notably:

- Principle 3: Transport decisions must be based on clear need and evidence – this will ensure that public money is spent effectively and maximise the benefits to the city region. In North

Wales, transport interventions that we are seeking to progress via our Regional Transport Delivery Plan are subject to the WelTAG process to demonstrate need and evidence.

- Principle 4: Transport must support placemaking – this will ensure that transport decisions are not made in isolation, and that transport will play an important role in supporting the success of the LCR as a place. We are taking a similar approach in North Wales, where the Corporate Joint Committees have been given statutory responsibility for developing both the Regional Transport Plan and the Strategic Development Plan. This approach reflects the links between transport, placemaking and land-use planning.
- Principle 5: Prioritise safe, clean, healthy travel in all we do – this will support progress towards net zero and modal shift. This approach is reflective of the Wales Sustainable Transport Hierarchy that influenced our Regional Transport Plan.
- Principle 6: The commitment to inclusivity, accessibility, and social value is in line Welsh Government’s wellbeing priorities, and our Regional Transport Plan in North Wales, where the social value of schemes is a key consideration
- Principle 7: Working with others to promote and deliver the vision, goals, principles and policies of the LTP – this is a principle that we are very supportive of as we are keen to continue working with the Liverpool City Region on shared aspirations and towards common aims.

There are a significant number of shared issues and opportunities between North Wales and the Liverpool City Region. There is also alignment of policy direction in how we are seeking to address those issues and maximise the benefits of the opportunities. We therefore look forward to working closely with the Liverpool City Region on key policy areas such as Network North Wales and cross-border movement in the future.

If you require any further information on the contents of this response, or to engage in further discussion, please contact Adam Graham, the Senior Transport Officer at Ambition North Wales on AdamGraham@uchelgaisgogledd.cymru

Yours sincerely,

Clr David A Bithell
Strategic Transport Sub-Committee Chair

REPORT TO THE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE

23 March, 2026

TITLE: Co-option onto the Strategic Transport Sub-Committee

AUTHOR: Claire Incedon, interim Deputy Monitoring Officer

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1. To consider the Membership of the Strategic Transport Sub-Committee.

2. DECISION SOUGHT

2.1. To recommend to the CJC co-option of Members (non-voting) onto the Sub-Committee to support its functions and responsibilities.

2.2. That the following be co-opted onto the Strategic Transport Sub-Committee for a further year:

- A Member representative from Eryri National Park who has responsibility for the transportation portfolio.
- A representative from Transport for Wales who has responsibility for the North Wales region.

3. REASON FOR THE DECISION

3.1. To maintain the strength of skills and expertise on the Sub Committee by renewing its membership to continue to include co-opted Member representation with specific experience and specialist expertise on transportation from a regional and national perspective.

4. BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS

4.1. Membership of Strategic Transport Sub-Committee is comprised of 6 voting Members who hold the portfolio for transportation from each of the Constituent Councils. Each of these Members have been co-opted onto the Sub-Committee with the power to vote.

4.2. Statutory Guidance actively encourages involving others to support the effective carrying out functions and responsibilities of the sub-committee. The Guidance outlines the importance of creating an inclusive and collaborative culture to ensure a wider perspective of its work. The strategic nature of the work of the Transportation Sub-Committee provides an opportunity for it to identify key partners and stakeholders that they consider would benefit their work. Who is co-opted and how is a matter for the CJC to decide.

4.3. By co-opting Members onto any Sub-Committee, the CJC is co-opting an individual as a Member of the NW CJC on such terms as it determines. This means that the co-opted person is appointed as a Member to support the function of the CJC, as opposed to representing any

organisation or employer. The terms of the co-option is set out in the co-option agreement and will relate only to those transport functions which are delegated to the Sub-Committee. The two additional Members would not be entitled to vote on any matter and would not be counted for quorum purposes, which remains calculated by reference to the STSC members appointed under the Constitution.

4.4. In considering who to recommend for co-option the Guidance refers to consideration of the type and range of organisations, and the skills and experience that would be beneficial. The CJC will take into consideration the following principles which you may find helpful when considering your recommendation:

- i. that the membership provides a range and balance of skills;
- ii. the nature of the task/activity to be considered;
- iii. the relevant expertise/skills which might be needed to support the Sub-Committee;
- iv. the gender, diversity, and cultural balance of sub-committee membership and how this might/should represent the communities the North Wales CJC serves.

4.5. The CJC has previously considered the following principles which are set out in the co-option agreement including the purpose for which the co-opted members are co-opted; how long the co-option will be for; voting rights and the terms of the co-option agreement. The co-option of the two representatives was agreed to be for one year, until 31 March 2025. The co-option agreement will be entered into for a further year.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1. There are no financial implications arising out of this report.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1. The legal and governance implications are addressed in the body of the report.

APPENDICES: None

STATUTORY OFFICERS RESPONSE:

i. Monitoring Officer:

No comments on the propriety of this report.

ii. Statutory Finance Officer:

No comments from the perspective of financial propriety.