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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** | [personal information redacted] |
| **Safe Routes in Communities**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** |  |
| **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\*** | Active Travel Fund | | | | |
| **Scheme Name** | **Greenfield Valley walking and cycling route phase 2** | | | | |
| **Year of Completion\*** | 2019-2020 | | | | |
| **SCHEME COSTS AND FUNDING** | | | | | |
| **Estimated total scheme cost at design stage** | 270k | **Actual total scheme cost at scheme completion** | 270k | **Difference** | 0 |
| **Reasons for difference between estimated and actual total scheme cost** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Total Welsh Government funding allocated** | 270k | **Total Welsh Government funding claimed** | 270k | **Difference** | 0 |
| **Reasons for difference between funding allocated and funding claimed** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **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 scheme is a package of local improvements to be delivered over a 3 year phased programme. Improving walking and cycling links through the Greenfield Valley to link Holywell with the coast has been an aspiration of the Town and Community Council and local residents for a number of years. The scheme has been selected following on from a recent meeting with Holywell Town Council, Assembly Member Ken Skates and the Chief Officer for Streetscene and Transportation who met to discuss a potential new train station at Greenfield. The improvements would add value to the business case for a Train Station at Greenfield and would ensure an Integrated Sustainable Transport approach to meet the needs of the local residents.  Assembly Member Ken Skates expressed support for the Greenfield Valley walking and cycling improvements recommending the proposals be put forward for Active Travel funding. Phase 1 for the Greenfield Valley Walking and Cycling route successfully received funding last year. Sustrans previously undertook a feasibility study for the project and have provided indicative costings for the three year phased programme of works. | | | | | |
| **Engagement**  **How did you engage with stakeholders in the planning and design of your scheme?** | | | | | |
| A number of meetings, including site visits have been carriedout with the Chair of the Greenfield Valley Trust, Countryside Services, Holywell Town Council, Regeneration, Sustrans and the Leader of St Beunos Heritage Trail which runs through parts of the Valley. Discussions included resolving drainage issues, aesthetically acceptable surfacing materials, signage prevention of vehicular access methods. Sustrans presently working on the feasibility study which will be shared with the above partners and the Communities benefitting from the proposals. Through the consultation for developing the Flintshire’s Rights of Way improvement Plan, it was identified that there was a need to develop and extend the rights of way network. This included the need for sustainable links within and between coastal communities to towns and facilities serving coastal communities. The consultation also highlighted the need to link coastal routes such as the Dee Coast Cycle Path and the All Wales Coastal Path to Communities.  The consultation included all Community and Town Councils, as well as individuals and interested organisations. The plan highlighted the need to develop active travel routes linking services and employment in Greenfield and Holywell | | | | | |
| **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 e.g. 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,* | | | | | |
| A 3m wide shared use tarmac path  New Lighting along the extent of the route  Signing, Dog bins, information/tourism boards  New security fencing along the extent of the school boundary | | | | | |
| **What worked well?** | | | | | |
| A structured approach to communications and forward works programming has been essential with the delivery of this scheme. The scheme also benefited from having a contract manager on site throughout the process. This was also utilised during the construction of Phase 1 which enabled a trouble free delivery. The tender award to the same contractor who delivered Phase 1 was also beneficial due to high standard of work and completion within timescales. | | | | | |
| **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 meetings with Holywell Town Council, Greenfield Valley Trustees and local business’s A number of meetings, including site visits have been carriedout with the Chair of the Greenfield Valley Trust, Countryside Services, Holywell Town Council, Regeneration, Sustrans and the Leader of St Beunos Heritage Trail which runs through parts of the Valley. Discussions included resolving drainage issues, aesthetically acceptable surfacing materials, signage prevention of vehicular access methods. Sustrans are presently working on the feasibility study which will be shared with the above partners and the Communities benefitting from the proposals | | | | | |
| **Summary of any relevant events that occurred DURING implementation and any changes in context** *e.g. fuel prices, land-use, travel patterns, weather events* | | | | | |
| The arrival of Covid in late Feb had a limited effect on construction due to completion in March | | | | | |
| **Impact of engagement and/ or any relevant events on Scheme Delivery** | | | | | |
| Early engagements with key stakeholders was instrumental in the success of the scheme delivery given financial year deadlines | | | | | |
| **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* | | | | | |
| The upgrade of the Greenfield Valley path to shared use walking and cycling facility will provide a safe sustainable transport corridor to connect Holywell to Greenfield.  The scheme will provide improved active travel access as follows:   * Integrated transport corridor to connect with the Core Bus Network running along the A548. * Active Travel access for residents of Holywell to Greenfield Business Park * Active Travel access for residents of Greenfield to Holywell Town Centre with its range of retail, eateries and leisure centre | | | | | |
| **What are the realised outcomes?** *Please quantify where possible* | | | | | |
| The provision of cycle way provision will help to address specific local issues, such as the lack of access to transport services to key service centres and connectivity within urban and coastal communities. This in turn will help to promote social inclusion, poverty reduction, and economic development in the areas (Holywell and Greenfield). This will enable people who do not have access to a private car, or those with special access requirements to have equal access to opportunities for work, health, education, training, social and leisure activities, supporting economic growth in the region. | | | | | |
| **How did you engage stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation of your scheme?** | | | | | |
| Regular feedback from Greenfield Valley management on increased usage within the valley | | | | | |
| **Summary of any relevant events that occurred AFTER implementation and any changes in context** *e.g. fuel prices, land-use, travel patterns, weather events* | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Impact of engagement and/ or any relevant events on Scheme Outcomes** | | | | | |
| Internal review board had regular meetings to discuss the scheme outcomes2 | | | | | |
| **What lessons have been learnt for future schemes?** | | | | | |
| Structured approach to communications and forward works program has been essential with delivery | | | | | |

**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 |
|  |