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# Introduction

### In line with the Local Transport Grants Award Letter (Schedule 2) dated 22 March 2018, 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 & Active Travel Mapping are excluded from this Annual Report.

### Guidance was not issued for 2017-18, as it was being updated to reflect the new WelTAG process. As such, this guidance note sets out the timing and content of the Annual Report for Local Transport Grants for schemes completed in the following 4 years: 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19. 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 30 September 2019.

# 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.

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 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19**, 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 June 2019, Police recorded road traffic collision and casualty data for 2018 was published. This allows Authorities that completed road safety capital schemes in the financial year ending March 2017 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 trail 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** | N/A |
| **Local Transport Network Fund**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** | N/A |
| **Active Travel Fund**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** | N/A |
| **Safe Routes in Communities**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** | **London Road, Trelawnyd**  [personal information redacted] |
| **Road Safety Capital**  **Lead contact name, email, telephone** | N/A |

### <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** | **London Road, Trelawnyd** | | | | |
| **Year of Completion\*** | 2016-17 | | | | |
| **SCHEME COSTS AND FUNDING** | | | | | |
| **Estimated total scheme cost at design stage** | £62,500 | **Actual total scheme cost at scheme completion** |  | **Difference** |  |
| **Reasons for difference between estimated and actual total scheme cost** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Total Welsh Government funding allocated** | £62,500 | **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 scheme was to upgrade the zebra crossing facility to a Puffin Crossing facility near to the school entrance on A5151 London Road, Trelawnyd.  The upgrade would improve routes to and from school, whilst continuing to keep the ksi’s to nil contributing to lowering casualty reduction of pupils and the community utilising the facility and it would also encourage active travel for pupils, parents and local residents. Currently, during school peak times, parked cars obstruct driver’s views of pupils, parents and residents waiting to cross at the existing zebra crossing, leading to near misses and drivers failing to stop for the waiting pedestrians**.**  Existing problems were -  Trelawnyd Primary School, residents and parents had raised concerns for a number of years about the following problems:   * The volume of traffic on London Road particularly at the start and end of the school day. * The dangers associated with crossing London Road at the beginning and end of the school day. * The amount of ‘near misses’ and vehicles failing to stop.   Parents also raised concerns about:  Their children’s safety when walking to/from school when crossing London road due to cars failing to stop at the Zebra.  A Puffin 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.  Parents would then have more confidence in allowing children to walk to school, which would alleviate parking congestion resulting in greater social inclusion and improved community safety and help the community to be more active.  Increased confidence that the Puffin Crossing would benefit the whole community, with the crossing assisting in common routes to local amenities such as the public house, post office and local shop as well as playing fields and popular walking routes | | | | | |
| **Engagement**  **How did you engage with stakeholders in the planning and design of your scheme?** | | | | | |
| * Liaison with Headtecher, and pupils. * Letters of Concern from Parents, Children and residents. * Statements from pupils (regarding concerns with existing facility). * Local press stories. * A Petition to make the road safer from pupils. * Road Safety Education, Training at the Zebra Crossing Site (we witnessed many cars, vans, lorries failing to stop whist Road safety Officers were stood at crossing wearing high Viz with children). * A School travel Plan. * The School partakes in National Standards Cycle Training levels 1 and 2. | | | | | |
| **Changes to scheme design**  **Did you make any changes to scheme planning and design? If so, what were they?** | | | | | |
| No | | | | | |
| **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?** | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |
| **SCHEME DELIVERY (WelTAG Stage 4)** | | | | | |
| **What outputs were delivered?** *E.g. X metres of bus lane,* | | | | | |
| The scheme included the upgrade of the zebra crossing facility to a Puffin Crossing facility near to the school entrance on A5151 London Road with associated surfacing and signage. | | | | | |
| **What worked well?** | | | | | |
| More children are walking to school and using the crossing facility as they now feel safer when crossing London Road. There have been no further reports of near missed. | | | | | |
| **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?** | | | | | |
| Frequent meetings and consultation events held with Local Members, town / Community Councils, Emergency Services, Local Businesses and Local residents throughout all key stages of the schemes development. | | | | | |
| **Summary of any relevant events that occurred DURING implementation and any changes in context** *e.g. fuel prices, land-use, travel patterns, weather events* | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |
| **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* | | | | | |
| * A Puffin 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. * Road Safety Officers attended the school on several occasions to discuss with children their concerns with regards to their safety on walking to and from school, and it was always highlighted as very dangerous to cross at the Zebra due to cars, vans, lorries etc. failing to stop, and if a Puffin Crossing was installed, this would make them feel safer and then would like to walk more, making them more actively travelling. | | | | | |
| **What are the realised outcomes?** *Please quantify where possible* | | | | | |
| Significant decrease in vehicular traffic within the immediate vicinity of the school which has resulted in significant increase in active travel. | | | | | |
| **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?** | | | | | |
| With the provision of the adequate infrastructure the puffin crossing has helped to eradicate the many near misses that occur.  The puffin crossing does not succumb to the same failings as a zebra crossing due to the nature of its function (red light indicating to drivers that pedestrians are waiting (without driver having to see pedestrians waiting like with a zebra crossing). 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.  The puffin crossing has improved road safety for vulnerable road users, especially children by providing a safe place to cross on the busy London Road and provide improved safety in the environment surrounding the school. | | | | | |

**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 |
|  |