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# Introduction

### In line with the Local Transport Grants Award Letter (Schedule 2), you are required to provide us on an annual basis with **data on scheme outcomes for a period of 3 years following completion of each scheme**. This is a requirement for all Local Transport Grants including Local Transport Fund (LTF), Local Transport Network Fund (LTNF), Active Travel Fund (ATF), Safe Routes in Communities (SRiC), Road Safety Capital (RSC). Road Safety Revenue is excluded from this Annual Report.

### This guidance note sets out the timing and content of the Annual Report for Local Transport Grants for schemes completed in the following financial years years: 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20. The Annual Report reports will:

### Allow for the effectiveness of individual schemes to be evaluated;

### Allow for local authorities to reflect on the appropriateness and effectiveness of engineering approaches and consider lessons learnt in designing future schemes;

### Provide the Welsh Government with information to inform the grant appraisal process for future years;

### Provide a source of peer to peer advice for other project managers.

### Annual Reports should also be considered as a good vehicle for circulating evidence of the effectiveness and benefits of transport investments to the general public, service users and other stakeholders.

### Packages of schemes that are ongoing should report on the individual projects that have been completed as part of the package.

### WelTAG 2017 states that schemes should use the new WelTAG document as an appropriate point. For schemes that have been delivered, this will be Stage Five. The Annual Report template is based on the requirements of Stage Five WelTAG.

##### A record of what was delivered

##### Evaluation of the process of delivering the project

##### Summary of any relevant events that occurred during and after implementation and any changes in context eg fuel prices, land-use or travel patterns

##### Explanation of how these changes affected the scheme

##### Comparison of outturn events to those anticipated

# Timing

### The Annual Report should be submitted to the Welsh Government no later than the 31 December 2020.

# Structure of Annual Report

### The Annual Report should be compiled using the attached template form and submitted as a Word document to the Welsh Government Transport Planning email inbox – [TransportPlanning@gov.wales](mailto:TransportPlanning@gov.wales)

Contact Information

### Please complete Table 1 with the appropriate contact details for your local authority.

Scheme Details

### Please complete Table 2 outlining all Local Transport Grants capital **scheme details for schemes completed in 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20**, including individual projects completed within packages. Please complete one form per scheme/ project.

### **Road Safety Capital**

### Road Safety Grants are awarded to Local Authorities to assist them in contributing to achieving the actions and targets within the Road Safety Framework for Wales.

### The Framework put in place an outcome based approach to road safety interventions, stressing the importance of using data and evidence to develop road safety schemes and establishing the principle that all engineering activity should be evaluated for effectiveness in reducing casualties and collisions.

### In July 2020, Police recorded road traffic collision and casualty data for 2019 was published. This allows Authorities that completed road safety capital schemes in the financial year ending March 2018 to provide first year reporting on the effectiveness of those schemes.

### Please complete Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 for each Road Safety capital scheme.

### **Road Safety Revenue**

### Monitoring of Road Safety Revenue schemes is dealt with separately during the grant application and in-year monitoring and evaluation processes. Separate information is not required under this reporting structure.

### Education and training interventions that are already approved are monitored locally. New interventions that are piloted through the grant include a requirement for monitoring and evaluation at the end of the first year trial period and revenue schemes outside of the approved areas must be supported by evaluations of scheme effectiveness.

### **Supporting Information**

### Include any additional tables and charts demonstrating progress against Local Transport Grant targets, including evidence from before and after monitoring.

### 3.1.7 Include any supporting commentary, scheme maps, plans and photographs; outlining its links to national and regional transport priorities, supporting Wales’ economic competiveness.

# Templates

### **Table 1 – Local Transport Grants Contact Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Local authority** | Flintshire County Council |
| **Local Transport Fund**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** |  |
| **Local Transport Network Fund**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** |  |
| **Active Travel Fund**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** |  |
| **Safe Routes in Communities**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** | [personal information redacted] |
| **Road Safety Capital**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** |  |

### <https://gov.wales/docs/caecd/publications/180516-privacy-notice-en.pdf>

### **Table 2 – Local Transport Grants Scheme Details**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grant\*** | Safe Routes in Communities | | | | |
| **Scheme Name** | Ysgol Maes Pennant, Mostyn | | | | |
| **Year of Completion\*** | 2019/20 | | | | |
| **SCHEME COSTS AND FUNDING** | | | | | |
| **Estimated total scheme cost at design stage** | £70k | **Actual total scheme cost at scheme completion** |  | **Difference** |  |
| **Reasons for difference between estimated and actual total scheme cost** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Total Welsh Government funding allocated** | £70k | **Total Welsh Government funding claimed** |  | **Difference** |  |
| **Reasons for difference between funding allocated and funding claimed** | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |
| **SCHEME PLANNING AND DESIGN (WelTAG Stages 1 – 3)** | | | | | |
| **Scheme objectives**  **What was the purpose of the scheme? What problems/ opportunities was it trying to address?** | | | | | |
| The aim of the scheme is to improve and provide a safer environment for children and parents walking and cycling to Ysgol Maes Pennant, Mostyn.  Ffordd Pennant is the main road serving the surrounding residential streets for residents to access the A548 coast road which gives access to Rhyl/Prestatyn to the north west and Flint, Deeside and further afield to Chester to the south west. Ffordd Pennant which is fairly straight road with a gradient which encourages high motor vehicles speeds, particularly when travelling downhill.  Bryn Pennant Primary School is the only primary school serving this settlement with 137 pupils aged between 3 and 11.  The scheme addresses Ffordd Pennant Road which is the main road through Maes Pennant in Mostyn.  In order to mitigate the hazards identified along the route and in an attempt to improve the viability of active modes of transport, a number of measures have been identified **Ffordd Pennant**   * Implementation of a zebra crossing facility * Introduction of a mandatory 20mph speed limit * Improved drop crossing facilities and tactile paving   The proposal to implement a 20mph mandatory speed limit on Ffordd Pennant will deliver the safety improvement required to ensure increased usage of active modes of travel.  Research supports that reducing traffic speed on the roads dramatically reduces the severity of collisions and encourages more people to walk (Road Safety Framework for Wales)  The location of a new Zebra Crossing and improved dropped crossings adjacent to Bryn Pennant School on Ffordd Pennant would provide a safe crossing point for pupils and the wider community needing to access facilities.  Improvements will cater for wheelchair users, mobility scooters users, and pedestrians with pushchairs accessing public transport facilities, which includes the new Bus Hub which will be located by the shops on the local high street.  The proposed scheme will encourage walking and cycling, by making routes safer and more pleasant and forms part of an Active Travel approach  The scheme will also improve facilities for members of the wider community particularly  The proposed scheme is along a bus route, and encouraging walking to transport services, by making routes safer and more pleasant, forms part of an integrated transport approach.  The location of the proposed Zebra Crossing on Ffordd Pennant would provide a safe crossing point for vulnerable groups and members of the community to safely cross this busy road, and to access the school and other amenities and the new bus hub.  **Overall**  With Welsh Government funding, the upgrade would greatly improve safe access to vital community services and facilities, whilst continuing to keep KSI’s to nil contributing to lowering casualty reduction of pupils and the community utilising the facilities.  The scheme will be designed in accordance with the .Active Travel Design principles | | | | | |
| **Engagement**  **How did you engage with stakeholders in the planning and design of your scheme?** | | | | | |
| Liaison with Head teacher, and pupils. Statements from pupils  The school partakes in National Standards Cycle Training levels 1 and 2.  A travel survey was sent to all pupils and parents in order to obtain current data on pupil travel patterns.  Letters of Concern from Parents, Children and residents. | | | | | |
| **Changes to scheme design**  **Did you make any changes to scheme planning and design? If so, what were they?** | | | | | |
| None | | | | | |
| **Reasons for change**  **If you changed the design what were the reasons?** | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |
| **Impact of changes**  **If you changed the design what was the impact eg. On costs and outcomes?** | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |
| **What lessons have been learnt for future schemes?** | | | | | |
| Structured approach to communications and forward works program has been essential with delivery | | | | | |
| **SCHEME DELIVERY (WelTAG Stage 4)** | | | | | |
| **What outputs were delivered?** *E.g. X metres of bus lane,* | | | | | |
| * Implementation of a zebra crossing facility * Introduction of a mandatory 20mph speed limit * Improved drop crossing facilities and tactile paving   The proposal to implement a 20mph mandatory speed limit on Ffordd Pennant will deliver the safety improvement required to ensure increased usage of active modes of travel. | | | | | |
| **What worked well?** | | | | | |
| A structured approach to communications and forward works programming has been essential with the delivery of this scheme  The scheme included the implementation of a Zebra Crossing near to the school entrance on Ffordd Pennant, traffic calming and implementation of a 20mph zone have all contributed to a safer environment for Active Travel modes of transport to access school. | | | | | |
| **What worked less well?** | | | | | |
| Time constraints associated with bid invitations and changes in the grant criteria | | | | | |
| **How did you engage with stakeholders in the delivery of your scheme?** | | | | | |
| Regular consultations with residents and local business enabled a smother scheme delivery. | | | | | |
| **Summary of any relevant events that occurred DURING implementation and any changes in context** *e.g. fuel prices, land-use, travel patterns, weather events* | | | | | |
| No relevant events occurred during construction | | | | | |
| **Impact of engagement and/ or any relevant events on Scheme Delivery** | | | | | |
| Regular consultations with residents and local business enabled a smother scheme delivery. | | | | | |
| **What lessons have been learnt for future schemes?** | | | | | |
| A structured approach to communications and forward works programming has been essential with the delivery of this scheme. | | | | | |
| **SCHEME OUTCOMES (WelTAG Stage 5)** | | | | | |
| **What were the anticipated outcomes?** *E.g. X% increase in active travel* | | | | | |
| A Zebra Crossing would provide improved road safety for vulnerable road users, especially children. It would improve safety of the environment around the school and the Community | | | | | |
| **What are the realised outcomes?** *Please quantify where possible* | | | | | |
| A reduction in speed from 30mph to 20mph along Pennant Road and the added measures of traffic calming and a raised Zebra Crossing facility have created a safer walking environment for pupils to attend school | | | | | |
| **How did you engage stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation of your scheme?** | | | | | |
| * Post scheme meetings with local members and the school. * Regular site visits and associated surveys.   Feedback through North wales Strategic Casualty Reduction Group. | | | | | |
| **Summary of any relevant events that occurred AFTER implementation and any changes in context** *e.g. fuel prices, land-use, travel patterns, weather events* | | | | | |
| As above, increase in Active modes of travel as a result of scheme improvement | | | | | |
| **Impact of engagement and/ or any relevant events on Scheme Outcomes** | | | | | |
| Internal review board had regular meetings to discuss the scheme outcomes. | | | | | |
| **What lessons have been learnt for future schemes?** | | | | | |
| The new crossing facility also reduces traffic speeds around the immediate vicinity of the school entrance, improving routes to and from school, supporting casualty reduction of high risk and vulnerable groups. | | | | | |

**Table 3 – Road Safety Capital Scheme Outcomes – Collision Reduction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Personal Injury collisions pre scheme (3 years data)** | | |
| Number of Fatal collisions | Number of Serious collisions | Number of Slight collisions |
|  |  |  |
| **Estimated Personal Injury collision reduction at application** | | |
| Estimated reduction of Fatal collisions | Estimated reduction of Serious collisions | Estimated reduction of Slight collisions |
|  |  |  |
| **Actual Personal Injury collisions post scheme delivery (3 years data)** | | |
| Number of Fatal collisions | Number of Serious collisions | Number of Slight collisions |
|  |  |  |
| **Performance against estimated collision reduction ( +/- estimate pa )** | | |
| Number of Fatal collisions | Number of Serious collisions | Number of Slight collisions |
|  |  |  |
| **Damage only collisions pre scheme (3 years data) if applicable** | | |
| Number of damage only collisions | | |
|  | | |
| **Actual damage only collisions post scheme delivery (3 years data) if applicable** | | |
| Number of damage only collisions | | |
|  | | |

### **Table 4 – Road Safety Capital Scheme Outcomes – Collision Reduction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Personal Injury casualties pre scheme (3 years data)** | | |
| Number of Fatal casualties | Number of Serious casualties | Number of Slight casualties |
|  |  |  |
| **Estimated Personal Injury casualty reduction at application** | | |
| Estimated reduction of Fatal casualties | Estimated reduction of Serious casualties | Estimated reduction of Slight casualties |
|  |  |  |
| **Actual Personal Injury casualties post scheme delivery (3 years data)** | | |
| Number of Fatal casualties | Number of Serious casualties | Number of Slight casualties |
|  |  |  |
| **Performance against estimated casualty reduction ( +/- estimate pa )** | | |
| Number of Fatal casualties | Number of Serious casualties | Number of Slight casualties |
|  |  |  |
| **High Risk and Vulnerable group casualties pre scheme (3 years data)** | | |
| Fatal casualties from **High Risk** groups (young people and motorcyclists) | Serious casualties from **High Risk** groups (Young People and Motorcyclists) | Slight casualties from **High Risk** groups (Young People and Motorcyclists) |
| Please specify: | please specify: | please specify: |
| Fatal casualties from **Vulnerable** groups (older drivers, children, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian) | Serious casualties from **Vulnerable** groups (older drivers, children, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian) | Slight casualties from **Vulnerable** groups (older drivers, children, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian) |
| Please specify: | Please specify: | Please specify: |
| **Actual High Risk and Vulnerable group casualties post scheme delivery (3 years data)** | | |
| Fatal casualties from **High Risk** groups (young people and motorcyclists) | Serious casualties from **High Risk** groups (Young People and Motorcyclists) | Slight casualties from **High Risk** groups (Young People and Motorcyclists) |
| Please specify: | please specify: | please specify: |
| Fatal casualties from **Vulnerable** groups (older drivers, children, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian) | Serious casualties from **Vulnerable** groups (older drivers, children, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian) | Slight casualties from **Vulnerable** groups (older drivers, children, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian) |
| Please specify: | Please specify: | Please specify: |

### **Table 5 – Road Safety Capital Scheme Outcomes – Safety Audits**

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide details of any road safety audits undertaken outlining observations and actions taken |
|  |