

Active Travel Prioritisation Tool - Methodology

Contents

1	Introduction
2	Development of the Active Travel Prioritisation Tool
	<i>Step 1 – Desk-top Study</i>
	<i>Step 2 – Development of Active Travel Prioritisation Tool – Consideration of Criteria</i>
	<i>Step 3 – Testing the Active Travel Prioritisation Tool using a selection of projects</i>
	<i>Step 4 – Adjusting the Criteria within the Active Travel Prioritisation Tool</i>
	<i>Step 5 - Finalising the template and continuing to populate the Tool with Proposed Schemes</i>
3	How to use the Active Travel Prioritisation Tool
4	Identification of Potential Active Travel Schemes
5	Active Travel Schemes Scored
6	Next Steps

Figure 1 – The Sustainable Travel Hierarchy

Figure 2 - Screenshot of the Summary Page from ATPT Excel Workbook

Table 1 – List of Themes, Criteria and Weighting used in the ATPT

Table 2 – Projects used to Test the draft ATPT

Table 3.a – Overview of Changes within the ATPT

Table 3.b – Overview of Changes within the ATPT Scoring Template

Table 4 – Overview of Maximum/Minimum Scores for each Theme and their Respective Weighting

Table 5 – Routes for Members of the Public to Propose New AT Schemes

Table 6 – Specifications of Scored Schemes

Table 7 – All Proposed Schemes, Summarised from Highest Score to Lowest Score

Table 8 – Comparison of Two Different Schemes with Identical Scores

Table 9 – Five Year Programme of Active Travel Projects

Abbreviations

ANNEX 1 – Scoring Templates

ANNEX 2 – Overview of Worksheet Content

ANNEX 3 - Mapping showing Locations of Schemes Scored to date

1 Introduction

The second National Travel Strategy (NTS2) for Scotland was published in 2020 and sets out an ambitious vision for the transport system for the next 20 years. *‘We will have a sustainable, inclusive, safe and accessible transport system, helping deliver a healthier, fairer and more prosperous Scotland for communities, businesses and visitors’¹.*

It continues to state that: *‘... to address the challenges and achieve the Priorities, we will embed the Sustainable Travel Hierarchy Figure in decision making by promoting walking, wheeling, cycling, public transport and shared transport options in preference to single occupancy private car use for the movement of people.’*



Figure 1 – The Sustainable Travel Hierarchy (source: [National Transport Strategy 2, 2020](#))

¹ Source: Active Travel transformation, [Annex A: Policy links](#)

APPENDIX 2

The Scottish Government have set a target to allocate at least £320 million or 10% of the transport budget to active travel by 2024/25, as a means to delivering more infrastructure to support the Sustainable Travel Hierarchy.

As the level of grant funding provided to Local Authorities for active travel² (AT) infrastructure increases, it becomes increasingly important to demonstrate how funding decisions are made. The Active Travel Prioritisation Tool (ATPT) has therefore been developed to collate information on active travel infrastructure projects proposed in Moray and provide an audit trail on how decisions on funding allocation are being informed.

A Prioritisation Tool, also known as a ‘scoring tool’ or a ‘multi criteria assessment tool’, enables the comparison of various schemes or interventions based on the same set of criteria, and to rank the schemes/interventions on the basis of a numerical score.

Over the years, Moray Council officers and communities have identified locations where new or improved active travel infrastructure or interventions are required to support pedestrians, wheelers and cyclists. These locations may be on routes to schools or in rural communities where a lack of provision is a deterrent to active travel. Furthermore as part of the review of the Local Development Plan (LDP), specific questions have been asked during the consultation events held this year with regard to areas where communities see a need for new or improved active travel infrastructure.

The number of schemes identified and their associated costs, far exceeds what could be delivered using available funding sources and staff resources. The aim of the ATPT is to provide a clear and transparent process for identifying which projects are prioritised to be taken forward for investigation, design and ultimately construction, and which projects will not be taken forward in the current context.

It should be noted that all suggestions from members of the public for new or improved active travel infrastructure will be assessed using the ATPT. Suggested schemes which would not meet funding criteria, e.g. if the infrastructure is for leisure journeys only or the intervention is to address a purely road safety concern, will remain on the list of suggested proposals but ‘flagged’ as not suitable. Members of the public who have suggested such schemes will be informed of the reasons why they are not being taken forward.

² Active travel” means moving around using your own effort – by walking, cycling or “wheeling” (e.g. like a wheelchair, mobility aid, tricycle or a children’s “push” scooter). It includes everyday journeys like going to school, to the shops or to work, as well as for exercise or recreation. Active travel is good for individual health and wellbeing, it helps to reduce carbon emissions and traffic congestion and helps mitigate climate change.

2 Development of the Active Travel Prioritisation Tool

A series of steps were undertaken in the development of the ATPT, including research into other such tools and a peer review. The aim with the ATPT is to be available to members of the public so they can see what influences new schemes and decision-making processes around them.

Step 1 – Desk-top Study

A desk-top study was undertaken which identified a number of other similar tools for schemes' prioritisation, which are in development or are in use:

- The Dumfries & Galloway Council: in partnership with Sustrans and Swestrans³, they have developed an ATPT in between 2018 and 2021, which has been made part of their Active Travel Strategy (ATS) and Delivery Plan 2022-2023.
- The Welsh Government: '[Active Travel Act Guidance](#)' (July 2021), in which [Appendix K](#) contains an 'audit tool for cycling and walking'.
- [ARUP for The Highland Council ATPT](#): adopted by The Highland Council Committee on 2nd Feb 2023, [item 13](#) (page 6 onwards).
- Perth & Kinross Council: '[Road Safety Projects Assessment Criteria](#)' (2019) contains '[Appendix 1 – Proposed assessment criteria for road safety requests](#)'.
- List of criteria (not weighted) by the City of Amsterdam.

The tools identified offered a good starting point in terms of themes and criteria identified, along with the application of weighting to scores. The Dumfries & Galloway Council Tool, which is an Excel workbook, has been used as a starting point and was then further developed to reflect the needs and conditions in Moray.

Step 2 – Development of Active Travel Prioritisation Tool – Consideration of Criteria

Following the desk-top study, the first set of relevant criteria were identified. The criteria used to review a scheme include the consideration of the need for and potential use of the scheme, the deliverability (including any known constraints) and a high level estimate of the cost. The full set of criteria were categorised into three 'themes' (Table 1).

The criteria were then considered and peer-reviewed by local stakeholders who represent Moray-wide community organisations⁴, Sustrans officers (including the Sustrans Mobility Planning Team), the

³ One of the seven Regional Transport Partnerships in Scotland and covers an area contiguous within the boundaries of Dumfries and Galloway Council.

⁴ A representative of Friends of the Dava Way, the Moray Local Outdoor Access Forum (LOAF) and The Rothes Way.

APPENDIX 2

Open Space Access & Policy Officer Ian Douglas (Core Paths) and officers from the Transportation team. These discussions gave insight in the strength and weaknesses of the criteria and led to adjustments to the format of the Tool.

An overview of the final set of themes and criteria are listed below in Table 1:

Themes	Criteria	Weighting
Infrastructure Points (IP)	Need – various trip generators are listed (ticked, but not scored) Usage (total number of trip generators scored) Demand Benefit Deliverability Cost Settlement size Speed limit	Theme weighting: 50%
Place Making Points (PMP)	Modal shift potential Remote areas connection Contribution to neighbourhoods' quality	Theme weighting: 30%
Overarching Criteria Points (OCP)	General feasibility Vulnerable groups Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) Opportunity for Grant Funding Maintenance Qualitative / overarching issues	Theme weighting: 20%

Table 1 – List of Themes, Criteria and Weighting used in the ATPT

Details from the initial Tool used by the Dumfries & Galloway Council, and the Tool that is proposed to be used in Moray is provided in Annex 1 to this document.

APPENDIX 2

Step 3 – Testing the Active Travel Prioritisation Tool using a selection of projects

Five projects were selected from the current active travel project list and assessed using the draft tool by Transportation Officers and the Sustrans Embedded Officer. The projects assessed covered a wide range of interventions, such as:

- Installing a new footway within a village;
- Creating a new active travel link between settlements; and
- Improving existing infrastructure and providing ‘missing links’.

An overview of these five schemes can be found in Table 2 below:

Name project	Type of intervention required
Aberlour – Mary Avenue	New footway on northern side of Mary Avenue to enable pedestrians to gain access to the school without the need to cross or walk in the carriageway.
Elgin – Maisondieu Road	Creating a 260m footway on the south side of Maisondieu Road, in between the Resource Centre and the Laichmoray roundabout.
Forres – High Street (Post Office / SPAR) to Brig Wynd / Burdshaugh	Improvement to an existing route which has a steep incline to provide a DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) compliant route.
Upper Rafford	New footway throughout the village, offering pedestrian route to access locations such as the Village Hall.
Newmill - Keith	Community request for an Active Travel route to connect Newmill to Keith. The B9116 which connects the settlements, is a 60mph road which can be a deterrent for some cyclists.

Table 2 – Projects used to Test the draft ATPT

Officers completed the tool individually for each project, after which they met to discuss their experience of using the tool and make suggestions for improvements.

Step 4 – Adjusting the Criteria within the Active Travel Prioritisation Tool

The testing of the ATPT with the five projects resulted in a number of changes and improvements of the Tool, which are described in Tables 3.a and 3.b below:

APPENDIX 2

Worksheet in ATPT	Justification
1. Summary	A spreadsheet was added containing a summary of all projects scored, including the type of intervention, their score, the estimated costs, the status of the scoring process, the status of the project, and the initials of the officer who has reviewed the scheme along with the initials of the officer who checked the scoring.
1. Summary – Type of intervention	The proposed schemes were categorised into ‘types of intervention’, with categories added/removed from the draft ATPT to better reflect Moray’s context and requirements. The updated list of ‘Type of interventions’ now is: • PW = Paths or Ways, walking and/or cycling – <i>building a new path or widening an existing way or path without taking away space from any adjacent public carriageway</i> • RR = Road space Reallocation (including roundabouts) – <i>reallocating space on the carriageway to Active Travel</i> • CC = Crossings and Control – <i>traffic signals at junctions or any type of pedestrian/cycle crossings (excluding bridges, that is considered to be a Path or Way)</i> • SCI = Supporting Cycle Infrastructure – <i>cycle parking stands, shelters or repair stations</i> • RS = Route Signage – <i>signage on cycle routes (rather than in town centres for instance) which qualifies for AT funding</i> • SL = Streetlights – <i>the provision of street lighting in isolation would not usually qualify for AT funding, but could be included as a larger bid for AT funding or redevelopment of an area</i> • PM = Place Making (benches, landscaping etc.) – <i>will not qualify for AT funding retrospectively, but could be included as a larger bid for place making/regeneration funding</i>

APPENDIX 2

	- KT = Kerbs and Tactile Paving – <i>would generally be funded as part of Disability Adaptations funding, unless as part of an upgrading of an AT route</i> - PT = Public Transport integration - <i>connecting with existing or future public transport</i> - ST = Study or further consideration required
2. How to use this Tool	A spreadsheet was added containing step-by-step information on the ATPT should be used.
3. Template	This spreadsheet contains the actual blank ATPT which is copied when each project is scored.
4. Manual	This spreadsheet contains guidance on how to score the individual criteria.
5. 'Flagged' Schemes	A spreadsheet was added to list all proposed schemes that are 'flagged' as they would not qualify for AT funding and therefore not added to the list of scored schemes. The 'flagged' schemes may be suggested again in the future and in some cases funding criteria may change which would enable consideration at a future date.

Table 3.a – Overview of Changes within the ATPT

The Figure below shows a screenshot from Excel Workbook, the '1. Summary' page:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	No.	Type	Project name	Estimated cost	Score (0-100)	Status (scoring related)	Project status
2	1	PW	Burn of Buckie AT bridge	£1,950,000.00	76	Agreed upon	Feasibility study complet
3	2	PW	Elgin - South Street	£150,000.00	75	Agreed upon	Feasibility not started
4	3	RR	Forres - Victoria roundabout	£500,000.00	74	Agreed upon	Under design
5	4	PW	Lhanbryde - to Muirhall Farm along Garmouth	£350,000.00	73	Agreed upon	Feasibility not started
6	5	RR	Forres - Victoria road	£700,000.00	72	Agreed upon	Feasibility not started
7	6	RR	Forres - St Leonards roundabout	250,000-400,000	72	Agreed upon	Feasibility not started
8	7	PW	Lossiemouth - Coullbank rd	£500,000.00	71	Agreed upon	Under design
9	8	PW	Forres - shared path from post office to Brig Wy	£200,000.00	70	Agreed upon	Feasibility study complet
10	9	CC	Elgin - Linkwood road	£200,000.00	69	Agreed upon	Under design
11	10	PW	Lossiemouth - A941 pedestrian and cycle path to	£1,000,000.00	68	Agreed upon	Feasibility not started
12	11	PW	Rafford - Upper Rafford footway	£200,000.00	67	Agreed upon	Under design
13	12	RR	Forres - A940 St Catherine's road footpath wide	£100,000.00	67	Agreed upon	Under design
14	13	CC	Forres - crossing Fleurs Pl	£50,000.00	65	Agreed upon	Feasibility not started
15	14	PW	Newmill - Keith AT route	£1,400,000.00	64	Agreed upon	Feasibility not started
16	15	PW	Duffus-Lossiemouth	£3,000,000.00	63	Agreed upon	Feasibility study complet
17	16	PW	Fogwatt - A941 footway	£700,000.00	62	Agreed upon	Feasibility study complet
18	17	PW	Aberlour - Mary Avenue	£300,000.00	62	Agreed upon	Design completed
19	18	PW	Dufftown - Maltkiln bridge and pavement	£400,000.00	58	Agreed upon	Design completed
20	19	PW	Portknockie - King Edward Terrace	£50,000.00	58	Agreed upon	Feasibility not started

Figure 2 - Screenshot of the Summary Page from ATPT Excel Workbook

APPENDIX 2

Changes made within the ATPT scoring template (referred to as 'ATPT Template' in Figure 2):

Criteria	Justification
Description of Proposed Scheme	A description and key details are listed above the scoring section of the Tool, which provides an insight into the context and considerations that have influenced the score against each criteria. Examples include how the scheme relates to nearest public and school transport, the level of community engagement and if there are any known constraints, e.g. land ownership or utilities.
Infrastructure – Additional trip generators/attractors	Several trip generators/attractors were added to the Tool. These are: ○ 'Social' (leisure, community hall, place of worship), ○ 'Financial services' (banks or post offices rather than ATMs), and ○ 'Future development sites'. The original template missed these trip generators/attractors. These additions provide a better representation of the likely number of users of the proposed scheme.
Infrastructure – Changed parameters of trip generators	- Work: considered when there's 10+ employees, whereas the original tool had 50+ employees. - Transport Hub: added car and bike share. Removed '3+ individual services' as that is unlikely to be achieved in rural settings. Ferry services has been removed too. - Tourism: removed this trip generator's title and replaced it with: ○ 'Public open space' (parks and recreation, sports grounds), and ○ 'Social' (community or village hall/culture/place of worship/entertainment facility/leisure), This is to reflect that funding is targeted towards infrastructure which supports every day journeys.

APPENDIX 2

Infrastructure – Distinction between active travel and leisure only	The ATPT is focussed on the improvement of Active Travel infrastructure to support ‘functional’ journeys. Grant Funding from Transport Scotland is for projects that help to increase everyday (i.e. functional) journeys. Leisure related trips are not considered functional. When a proposed scheme is found to support leisure trips only, the project will be passed on to parts of the Council with access to different funding sources, e.g. for economic or tourism development, or for the upgrading of core paths. The original Tool did not distinguish projects for leisure/tourism purposes from projects which would be used for functional journeys.
Infrastructure – Cost Estimates	Cost scoring in the original Tool was based on very low cost values (ranging from £10,000 and below, to £40,000+). However, the scale of schemes being considered are more ambitious in scale to reflect the increasing levels of funding available. The scoring for cost estimates have been revised (ranging from £30,000 and below, to £500,000+). The costs are estimated on the basis of £1,000 per linear metre for smaller schemes. For schemes which are large scale, more complex or have known constraints, a higher level of optimism bias has been applied.
Infrastructure – Settlement size	In the absence of any specific and regular survey data, the size of a settlement(s) is a good proxy for comparing the potential number of users of an intervention, which to a certain extent can justify the investment. The original Tool did not contain a score for the size of settlement.
Infrastructure – Speed limit	Noting the speed limit of any adjacent public road to the proposed scheme within the Tool provides an indication of the potential road safety benefits, in the absence of any accident record (note: Moray has very low levels of recorded accidents involving pedestrians or cyclists). The original Tool did not contain the aspect of speed limit or accident rate.

APPENDIX 2

Place making – <i>No changes</i>	No changes were made as the criteria were considered relevant to the Moray area and local planning policy.
Overarching criteria – Vulnerable users	This criteria was added to highlight proposed schemes which would specifically serve vulnerable users, such as (unaccompanied) youth, elderly people and people with disabilities. A scheme could be an improvement for those groups in a direct way (a shared path leading to a school or health centre for instance) or indirectly (a path leading to a bus stop, and the bus takes people to a health facility or to work).
Overarching criteria – SIMD	Proposed schemes which would serve areas with lower SIMD would support the travel needs of people with lower incomes. Scoring the SIMD of the location of the project thus highlights the potential to tackle transport poverty and barriers to inclusivity.
Overarching criteria – Maintenance	The aspect of funding is taken into account in the original Tool, however there was no specific consideration of funding available for the long term maintenance of the scheme. Some interventions might get funded but if the scheme is not added to the List of Public Roads, the costs for maintenance are not necessarily accounted for. The Maintenance criteria has therefore been added to take account of this consideration.
Weighting of scores – <i>No changes</i>	In the original Tool the weighting applied per theme ('Infrastructure', 'Place making' and 'Overarching infrastructure') as 50%-30%-20% respectively. This weighting was considered acceptable.

Table 3.b – Overview of Changes within the ATPT Scoring Template

Step 5 - Finalising the template and continuing to populate the Tool with Proposed Schemes

The revised ATPT has been used to assess proposed schemes on the list held by officers and schemes identified through the recent public consultation events. Once the schemes had been assessed, minor adjustments were made to clarify the criteria and how they were scored.

APPENDIX 2

A second meeting was arranged with the Sustrans Mobility Planning Team to discuss the ATPT and seek comments. The outcome was that no changes were made to the ATPT. It was agreed that the criteria used would enable a good comparison of proposed schemes and the method of scoring was robust.

The ATPT will be a 'live' tool which will be regularly updated with any new proposed schemes from the public and community groups.

3 How to use the Active Travel Prioritisation Tool

The ATPT consists of an Excel Workbook with an individual spreadsheet for the summary and explanatory information along with a spreadsheet for each proposed scheme, as shown on Figure 2 above. The worksheets are:

- '1. Summary'; which contains a summary of all scored proposals, including the:
 - Type of intervention
 - Project name
 - Estimated cost
 - The 'score'
 - Status (of the scoring process)
 - Project status
 - Date of the assessment and by whom (initials of officers, including the officer who reviewed the assessment)
 - Remarks
- '2. How to use this Tool'; an explanation on how to populate the ATPT for a proposed scheme
- '3. ATPT Template'; which is the scoring tool itself and needs to be copied for each new proposal
- '4. Manual'; this explains how to give a certain score including its reasoning
- '5. Flagged schemes'; this lists the schemes that are flagged and mentions why
- Proposed schemes in alphabetic order, as per the project name

Annex 2 contains copies of the above worksheets.

Each individual criteria is given a score between 1 and 5, generally with increments of 1 point⁵. The overall scoring and weighting for each Theme (as found on work sheet '3.ATPT Template') is:

⁵ One exception: 'vulnerable groups' will either be given 0 or 5 points.

Theme	Minimum score	Maximum score	Weighting
Infrastructure	7	35	50%
Place Making	3	15	30%
Overarching Criteria	5	30	20%
Total points	15	80	100%
Total score ⁶	19.33	100	100%

Table 4 – Overview of Maximum/Minimum Scores for each Theme and their Respective Weighting

The highest weighting (50%) has been assigned to the Infrastructure theme. The key criteria for this Theme include demand/need, cost, deliverability etc. These are the most important factors when initially considering a proposed scheme.

The next highest weighting (30%) is given to the Place Making theme, which provides an indication of whether they would be a positive change of behaviour and connectivity; i.e. more walking, wheeling, cycling, shared transport and integration with public transport, and less single car use (see the Sustainable Transport Hierarchy at Figure 1) as a result of the proposed scheme, in particular if the proposed scheme is connecting a remote area to local facilities.

The third theme, Overarching Criteria, is given the remaining 20% of the weighting.

Once a total score has been calculated for a proposed scheme it is added to the '1.Summary' work sheet. The Summary worksheet automatically orders the proposed schemes from high (score) to low. Completed assessments are reviewed by a second officer, before being signed off.

As the ATPT is a live assessment tool, with new schemes being added on a regular basis, the 'rank' of a proposed scheme within the scheme list may change over time.

⁶ A formula has been applied within the work sheet, to make sure the highest score get 100.

4 Identification of Potential Active Travel Schemes

Many of the active travel projects which have been completed in the past ten years have been requested by members of the public through dialogue with officers, local members and community councils, including through public consultation events or as a result of a complaint raised about how difficult it was to make a particular journey. Over the years these suggestions have been added to a list of 'reserve schemes'. More recently through the consultations associated with the [Active Travel Strategy 2022-2027](#) and the review of the Local Development Plan, barriers to active travel have been specifically identified and further schemes suggested..

Not all of the suggested schemes are suitable for taking forward as an active travel project as they would not meet the funding criteria, e.g. s where the proposed infrastructure would facilitate leisure trips only, or where it is a road safety concern.

Members of the public have recently been able to propose new schemes through the LDP consultation events. Other opportunities to communicate ideas to Transportation officers are listed below (along with the details of the recent consultations):

What	How and when	How feedback was generated
Public consultations	Transportation officers have attended the following Local Development Plan consultation events: 4th March 2023 – Forres 22nd April 2023 – Aberlour 27th April 2023 – Dufftown 15th May 2023 – Elgin Academy (consultation event for pupils) 27th May 2023 – Elgin 17th June – Lossiemouth 27th June 2023 – Fochabers 26th August 2023 – Buckie 9th September 2023 – Keith	- Verbal feedback was collected from members of the public on how to improve the current AT network and to encourage members of the public to identify barriers to active travel. - Large print maps were used to take notes on and request members of the public to identify gaps in the network and other relevant issues. - The officers made use of the online tool (see below) to

APPENDIX 2

	As the Local Development Plan review continues Transportation officers will attend any future events.	collect online feedback on the current AT network, and where the public identified gaps. - The feedback has been added to the ATPT, and proposed new schemes have been scored.
Formal/ Informal Meetings with Transportation officers	Meetings with officers can occur during site visits, or during events. Three 'Bike Fests' have been held in 2023 where the officers engaged with members of the public and spoke about AT. These took place: 19th August 2023 – Elgin <i>(approximately 100 attendees)</i> 27th August 2023 – Aberlour <i>(approximately 80 attendees)</i> 23rd September 2023 – Forres <i>(approximately 250 attendees)</i> More information can be found here: https://newsroom.moray.gov.uk/event/moray-bikefests	- Verbal feedback was collected from members of the public on how to improve the current AT network. - The officers made use of the online consultation tool (see below) to collect feedback on the current AT network, and where people identify gaps. The feedback on proposed schemes has been added to the ATPT.
Raising a complaint	Complaints raised by members of the public regarding a piece of existing AT infrastructure or 'gap' in the network.	- This online link⁷ will direct members of the public to the relevant department that can deal with their complaint. - During encounters with officers, members of the public can share their views regarding the AT

⁷ http://www.moray.gov.uk/moray_standard/page_100047.html

APPENDIX 2

		infrastructure. Officers will then have to decide if this is a maintenance or safety matter (and thus not funded through regular AT grant funding) or if it concerns AT related matters.
New: the online Active Travel Portal	- A new tool has been developed early 2023, to support the officers during their public consultations. It is considered an efficient way to process information gathered during consultations and engagements with communities and can be accessed by using a tablet, laptop or smartphone. - By providing the consultations the link to the portal, people attending consultation events can also submit feedback when back at home. - The link to the online tool is passed on to stakeholders⁸ within the network of the officers. - The link can be found on the Moray Council website: 'Home > Roads and Transport > Traffic Management > Consultations	- Online feedback was generated through the online tool. - This feedback is collated in an Excel workbook, which is send to the relevant officer each Monday. The officer makes sure that the relevant suggestions are added to the ATPT. - People who submit their remarks, can choose to send an email to activetravel@moray.gov.uk, in order to stay updated
Send an email	- Members of the public can send an email to the generic AT email address of the Moray Council, which is monitored by AT related Officers.	- The email address is: activetravel@moray.gov.uk

Table 5 – Routes for Members of the Public to Propose New AT Schemes

In addition to the above, the development of some schemes can come through community engagement on an entirely different matter.

⁸ Such as Friends of the Dava Way, Lossiemouth Community Development Trust, Forres Active Travel Group, LOAF, the Rothes Way.

APPENDIX 2

In 2021 the Finderne Community Council contacted officers with concerns about the speed of traffic passing through Rafford, seeking the introduction of traffic calming measures. A speed survey was undertaken, the results of which showed that the speed of traffic was not excessive. However the resident's perception of the speed was influenced by the fact that they had to walk within the carriageway as there was no footway and that when they were emerging from their accesses, the sightlines were restricted by boundaries which were close to the road. Officers worked with the community to secure garden ground from individual properties to provide a new footway. The design of this scheme is now being finalised with a view to construction taking place by the end of the financial year.

5 Active Travel Schemes Scored

At the time of writing this report, 32 active travel schemes have been scored using the ATPT. Some of these schemes were already on a list held by officers, whereas other schemes have recently been suggested by members of the public.

The range of schemes identified and scored so far is diverse and includes:

- Long distance paths – examples are in between Lossiemouth and Duffus, Garmouth and Mosstodloch, and in between Newmill and Keith.
- Reallocation of road space at roundabouts – examples are on Victoria and St Leonards roundabouts in Forres, and of parts of the carriageways on Church Street in Dufftown and Maisondieu Road in Elgin.
- Controlled crossings – examples are on St Andrew’s Square in Buckie and on Linkwood Road in Elgin.
- Interventions that interconnect with public transport, such as the footway in Fogwatt.

In terms of scoring range, the current lowest score is 40 and the current highest score is 76. It should be noted that the lowest score possible using the tool is 19 and the highest possible score is 100.

The following table summarises the numbers of schemes identified for different types of active travel infrastructure and the total estimate costs for each category of scheme.

Type of request	Total number of requests	Estimated total costs (£) per type of intervention
Paths and Ways	23	£50,010,000
Road space Reallocation	6	£1,685,000
Controlled Crossing	3	£370,000
Grand total	32	£52,065,000

Table 6 – Specifications of Scored Schemes

Annex 3 contains a series of maps showing the locations of the proposed schemes scored using the ATPT.

APPENDIX 2

The schemes shown on the maps in Annex 3, are summarised below. The numbering of these schemes reflects their current rank within the ATPT (note: as schemes are completed and new ones added, this ranking is subject to change).

	Scheme
1	Burn of Buckie - Active Travel Bridge
2	Elgin - Dr Grays to Hay Street
3	Forres – A940 Victoria Roundabout
4	Lhanbryde - to Muirhall Farm along C1E Garmouth Road
5	Forres - Victoria Road
6	Forres - St Leonards roundabout
7	Lossiemouth - Coulardbank Road
8	Forres - shared path from post office to Brig Wynd / Burdshaugh
9	Elgin - Linkwood Road
10	Lossiemouth - A941 pedestrian and cycle path to connect with other AT routes along B9135
11	Rafford - Upper Rafford footway
12	Forres - A940 St Catherine's Road footpath widening
13	Forres - crossing Fleurs Place
14	Newmill - Keith AT route
15	Duffus-Lossiemouth
16	Fogwatt - A941 footway
17	Aberlour - Mary Avenue
18	Dufftown - Maltkiln bridge and pavement
19	Portknockie - King Edward Terrace
20	Findochty - the Stripe footpath to school <> A942

APPENDIX 2

21	Spynie Hall footpath
22	Duffus - Elgin cycle path
23	Forres West - Nairn Road to A96
24	Elgin - Edgar Road to Doocot Park
25	Dufftown - Church Street footway
26	Buckie - St Andrew's Square
27	Garmouth - Mosstodloch cycle path
28	Elgin to Hallowood Road Troves path
29	Garmouth - Lhanbryde cycle path
30	Elgin - Maisondieu Road link to Resource Centre
31	Rothiemay - Anderson Drive B9118
32	Garmouth - Lossiemouth cycle path

Table 7 – All Proposed Schemes, Summarised from Highest Score to Lowest Score

When looking at the types and locations of schemes proposed and the scoring of the criteria, it is noted that:

- The balance is roughly in favour of schemes in urban/built up areas versus rural locations (i.e schemes connecting communities), 69% - 31% respectively.
- The proposed schemes ranked highly score either 6, 7 or 8 out of 9 trip generators, which is very high. It indicates that these schemes represent interventions that are meaningful in terms of providing connections to everyday facilities.
- Highly ranked schemes also tend to have scored five points for increasing accessibility for vulnerable groups, such as children, elderly and people visiting health centres.
- In terms of SIMD, the majority of schemes scored are in areas that range from medium to least deprived.
- Eight schemes out of the 32 have an estimated costs in excess £1,000,000. Seven of them are in 'rural' (or, less-populated) settings and would connect communities, and only one is within a settlement (the new active travel bridge in Buckie).
- Most proposed schemes are of type 'PW', which means 'paths and ways', indicating 'building or widening an existing way or path without taking away space on the carriageway'. The next

APPENDIX 2

category is 'RR', which stands for Roadspace Reallocation, and requires taking away space from the carriageway to provide more space for active travel schemes. Three schemes suggest changes regarding controlled crossings.

An interesting comparison can be made by looking at two very different schemes which both scored 62 points. Table 7 summarises the two schemes and their key criteria, and indicates that the scoring tool is not biased towards schemes in urban areas:

	Aberlour - Footway along northern side of Mary Avenue	Fogwatt - Footway alongside A941
Description of Scheme	New footway on northern side of Mary Avenue to enable pedestrians to gain access to the school without the need to cross or walk in the road.	A footway is requested by the small community of Fogwatt (estimate population of 155), along the A941 which is a 50mph road. This proposed scheme would assist people walking to the bus stops (with bus connections into Elgin and Dufftown) and to the Community Hall, which are added values in terms of connectivity.
Estimated Cost	£300,000	£700,000
Infrastructure Score	Score: 23 Scores high at 'demand', 'benefit' and 'deliverability' which indicates that it will serve many people directly.	Score: 19 Scores high at 'demand', 'benefit' and 'speed limit' which indicates that it will serve many people directly. Settlement size is very low, but the footway will improve safety as drivers will be anticipating pedestrian activity when they see the footway.

APPENDIX 2

		The footway would also provide a route for school pupils to walk to their school bus pick up point.
Place Making Score	Score: 7 A higher score would be expected, however there is already a footway on the southern side of the road (albeit narrow). The missing link is about 180m long on a road where the speed limit is 30mph. Behaviour change will not directly be changed as many people already walk there, but the route will become safer and provide an alternative to walking in the carriageway.	Score: 11 A fairly high score is given, and mostly attributed to behaviour change. Though people already walk alongside the road (visible informal path in the verge), many people won't and may be driving between locations within the settlement. The missing link is approximately 700m on a road where the speed limit is 50mph. With a formally established path, residents would now be able to walk confidently within the settlement. The proposed scheme also scores well when it comes to connecting between neighbourhoods. Not only does the path serve internal movements, it also helps connect (by means of public transport) to other settlements.
Overarching Score	Score: 22 A relatively high score, the scheme would be used by vulnerable groups of people	Score: 20 An average score, but indicating the importance of safeguarding vulnerable

APPENDIX 2

	and has a high likelihood to get funded (and thus maintained).	groups of users and the overall feasibility of the potential project. It's an expensive project, which is reflected in the score as well.
--	--	---

Table 8 – Comparison of Two Different Schemes with Identical Scores

6 Next Steps

Using the ATPT to provide a relative 'score' for a proposed scheme can assist in the decision making process for where funding and resources are directed. The ATPT tends to show lower scores for proposed schemes that provide connection to a limited number of trip generators, often in combination with high estimated costs, projects inside a residential area (thus, not connecting areas) and/or deliverability (landownership, utilities or challenging topography, etc.) issues. The Tool therefore supports the main aim of funding AT schemes: to increase the accessibility and opportunities to making safe and accessibly everyday journeys.

With annual Cycling Walking and Safer Routes (CWSR) funding in the region of £615,000, it is clear that the level of funding could only deliver some of the proposed schemes.

However, Scottish Government have allocated an additional £20 million as part of its active travel funding for 2023/24 to enhance walking, cycling and wheeling for everyday transportation. It is anticipated that this additional funding will be an annual competitive fund called the 'Active travel Transformation Fund' (ATTF). The ATTF will provide the investment to local authorities, regional transport partnerships and national park authorities in collaboration with Transport Scotland. This particular fund is dedicated to assisting local authorities in strengthening their capabilities, and ensuring that the increased investment translates into tangible changes in communities.

The ATPT will be used to influence decision making on the priority of projects. However there will be other influences which will mean that some proposed schemes will be undertaken before those with a higher score. For example, the highest scoring scheme, the Burn of Buckie Active Travel Bridge, is a complex project which is also supported by developer obligations. It will take a number of years and significant funding to deliver this project. Resources will be allocated to develop the scheme. However, other smaller projects will be delivered before it is completed.

Furthermore officers have been working on a number of schemes which have been designed, are in the process of being designed or are due to be constructed during this and next financial year. Again, these projects will be delivered before any new schemes, which may have a higher score, are considered.

The intention of the ATPT is to influence decision making, but not for decisions to be solely based on the results of the assessments. Some lower scoring proposed schemes may never come forward as newer, higher scoring schemes are likely to be taken forward before them.

APPENDIX 2

The following table sets out the committed and anticipated projects (subject to securing funding) over the next five years⁹:

Financial Year	Scheme (ranked number)	Type of Intervention	Estimated Costs	Project Stage	Anticipated Completion Date
2023/24	Roseisle Hall	Missing footway link in rural settlement.	£75,000	Designed during 2022/23 constructed during 2023/24.	Completed September 2023.
	Lang Walk, Elgin	Widen existing footway to cycle track to connect Toucan crossing on Morriston Road to the existing cycle track to the north.	£60,000	Designed during 2022/23; contractor has been procured and to start on site Q3 2023/24.	To be completed during 2023/24.
	Fochabers Pedestrian Islands at Milne's Primary School	Upgrading of pedestrian islands to accommodate cyclists and improve lighting.	£100,000	Designed 2023/24; contractor procured. Start on site Q3 2023/24.	To be completed during 2023/24.
	Garmouth	Missing footway link at War Memorial.	£50,000	Designed during 2022/23 due to be constructed during 2023/24.	To be completed during 2023/24.
	Coulardbank Road, Lossiemouth	New Toucan crossing at High School.	£150,000	Design underway and signals equipment procured. Timing of construction to take advantage of school holidays.	Anticipated to be completed Q1 or Q2 2024/25.
	B9010 St Leonard's Road, Forres	Build-out to assist pedestrians cross the road	£140,000	Design update underway and to be completed Q4 2023/24. Public consultation took	Anticipated to be completed during 2024/25.

⁹ Note that some schemes mentioned in Table 9 have been brought forward before the ATPT was developed and taken into use. These schemes are therefore not scored.

APPENDIX 2

		and additional footway.		place during Q2 2023/24.	
	Victoria Roundabout, Forres (3) and A940 St Catherine's Road (12)	Roadspace reallocation to provide safer crossings for pedestrians/ cyclists and widening of footway to provide cycle track.	£500,000 and £100,000 Respective y.	Feasibility Study completed and design work underway. To be subject of Active Travel Transformation Fund application required.	If funding is secured, anticipated to be completed 2027/28.
	Coulardbank Road, Lossiemouth (7)	Cycle track.	£500,000	Under design.	If funding is secured, anticipated to be completed 2026/27.
	Linkwood Road, Elgin (9)	Pedestrian Island and road realignment.	£200,000	Under design.	If feasible and option agreed, works anticipated during 2026/27.
	Elgin City Centre	Vehicle access control measures to support existing Pedestrianisation Order.	£750,000	Design work commissioned and due to be completed 2023/24.	Subject to funding being secured through specific allocation or application.
	Barhill Road/St. Peter's Road/ Golfview Drive junction, Buckie	Improvements to pedestrian routes through junction.	tbc	Feasibility Study and options appraisal commissioned.	If feasible and option agreed, works anticipated during 2026/27.
2024/25	Ferry Road/ Balnakeith Road, Forres	Road realignment and widening of pinch point to improve existing cycle track.	£85,000	Third party land has been purchased. Design work completed. Works to be completed as part of road re-surfacing project at A940 junction.	Anticipated to be completed 2024/25.
	Upper Rafford (11)	New footway providing	£200,000	Land secured and cleared with new boundaries erected.	Anticipated to be completed 2024/25.

APPENDIX 2

		access to Village Hall.		Design work nearing completion.	
	Burn of Buckie, Buckie (1)	New Active Travel Bridge.	£1,950,000	Feasibility Study completed. Detailed investigations and design work to commence during 2024/25.	Completion date dependant on external funding, including Developer Obligations.
	Moss Street, Elgin	Roadspace reallocation to provide North-South Elgin AT Link.	£1,500,000	Options Appraisal and initial design completed.	Subject to funding being secured through specific applications e.g. LUF or ATTF.
	Lossie Wynd/ Commerce Street, Elgin	Roadspace reallocation to provide North-South Elgin AT Link.	£750,000	Options Appraisal and initial design completed.	Subject to funding being secured through specific applications e.g. LUF or ATTF.
	South Street, Elgin (Dr Grays to Hay Street) (2)	Widening of footway and improvements to crossing points.	£150,000	Feasibility Study to be undertaken.	If feasible and option agreed, works anticipated during 2025/26.
Medium Term 2025/26 to 2027/28	C1E Garmouth Road - Lhanbryde to Muirhall Farm (4)	Footway to connect village to Core Path to Urquhart.	£350,000	Feasibility Study not started.	If feasible, and subject to funding, likely to be completed by 2030.
	Victoria Road, Forres (5)	Footway widening to provide cycle route.	£700,000	Feasibility Study not started.	If feasible, and subject to funding, likely to be completed by 2030.

Table 9 – Five Year Programme of Active Travel Projects

APPENDIX 2

It is intended that should the Tool be approved, the ATPT will then be published online, including the scores of all proposed schemes that have been assessed at that time. This will enable members of the public to understand some of the factors which influence the decision making process in the bringing forward of proposed schemes.

This information be available on the Moray Council Website, once updates to the relevant pages have been undertaken.

Scored schemes and the project status, will be updated on an annual basis as part of the update of the Active Travel Strategy. Members of the public are able to submit questions or feedback on the schemes through activetravel@moray.gov.uk.

Finally, it is intended to use the Tool until such time that a national assessment tool for active travel projects has been developed and in use. An update on the development of any national tool will be provided as part of the annual update of the Active Travel Strategy.

ABBREVIATIONS

AT = Active Travel

ATPT = Active Travel Prioritisation Tool

ATS = Active Travel Strategy

ATTF = Active Travel Transformation Fund

CWSR = Cycling Walking and Safer Routes

DDA = Disability Discrimination Act

LDP = Local Development Plan

LUF = Levelling Up Fund

SIMD = Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation