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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** | Mountain Lane, Buckley  [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** | **Mountain lane, Buckley** | | | | |
| **Year of Completion\*** | 2019-2020 | | | | |
| **SCHEME COSTS AND FUNDING** | | | | | |
| **Estimated total scheme cost at design stage** | £205,000 | **Actual total scheme cost at scheme completion** |  | **Difference** |  |
| **Reasons for difference between estimated and actual total scheme cost** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Total Welsh Government funding allocated** | £205,000 | **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 purpose of the scheme was to 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 facilities, it would also encourage active travel for pupils, parents, local residents and the community.  Within recent years, Flintshire County Council received a large number of concerns from residents, Pupils, Parents, Teaching staff and Local Members due to concerns of both increasing volumes and speed of traffic in the vicinity of the school. Particular concern was raised in relation to motorists ignoring the advisory speed limit of 20 mph within the immediate vicinity of the school with many residents concerned for the safety of the children who utilise this route on a daily basis.  Many of the problems identified along the route related to high levels of vehicle usage and associated congestion both within the immediate court ledge of the school as well as along a number of access routes in to the vicinity. The high volume of traffic on Knowle Lane, Church Road, Hawksburry Road and Linthorpe Road particularly at the start and end of the school.  Indiscriminately parked vehicles along the route combined with restricted carriageway width on Knowle Lane were creating congestion issues as other vehicles, including service buses, had to queue and negotiate oncoming vehicles before being able to manoeuvre and pass individual obstructions which in many cases, involved vehicles driving on the footway. The resulting que of traffic regularly extended as far as the junction with Church Road to the North and Victoria Road to the South creating a hazardous environment for children accessing Mountain Lane Primary School. There were also parked vehicles on the footways blocking a number of junctions and private drives which again resulted in forcing children and parents to walk in the live carriageway.  The absence of a zebra crossing or other means to support pupils when crossing Knowle Lane to access the school gates was of particular concern with many Children forced to ‘weave’ amongst queuing traffic and parked vehicles.  A nearby track (known locally as The Common) provided access to the West connecting Higher Common Road and surrounding estates. Although the track was well utilised by children both walking and cycling to and from school, the route was of poor surface, insufficient width (under 2 metres wide) and had little if any lighting provision which is of major concern during winter months.  Increased confidence that this scheme would greatly improve and address safety concerns and encourage children and the community to walk or cycle, therefore achieving the aim of increasing active travel. | | | | | |
| **Engagement**  **How did you engage with stakeholders in the planning and design of your scheme?** | | | | | |
| Flintshire County Council Officers engaged with the school, pupils, residents and other key stakeholders during the scheme design, where alternative measures were considered. The feedback received was extremely positive from all stakeholders, and North Wales Police also said they supported the principles of the scheme. | | | | | |
| **Changes to scheme design**  **Did you make any changes to scheme planning and design? If so, what were they?** | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |
| **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,* | | | | | |
| * Implementation of a 20mph mandatory speed limit. * Introduction of a ‘One Way’ system (except for Cyclists) * Implementation of Cycle Friendly Traffic Calming Features at strategic intervals * Zebra Crossing adjacent to the frontage of the main School building to be integrated within a proposed 8m long Raised Table. * Implementation of parking restrictions. * Implementation of a Signalised Crossing to replace the previous ineffective Zebra Crossing facility. * The upgrade of an existing footpath to achieve a 3m wide Shared Use Footway / Cycleway Facility. * Implementation of Quiet Street Measures. | | | | | |
| **What worked well?** | | | | | |
| The 3 meter shared use facilities, Zebra Crossing and the One Way system. Also, the new improved shared facility through the common is greatly used for walking and cycling to school. . More children are walking to school and there have been no reports of near misses. | | | | | |
| **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* | | | | | |
| * The improvements would greatly improve both the quality and safety of routes to and from Mountain Lane School, directly contributing to the casualty reduction of both pupils and the wider community by maintaining an environment of zero KSI’s. * Improved safety of the route combined with upgraded infrastructure will encourage the utilisation of active modes of travel for pupils, parents and local residents. * Research indicates that for many people the biggest barrier to walking and cycling is concern for safety. Currently, during school peak times, parked cars and traffic congestion obstruct driver’s views of pupils, parents and residents waiting to cross the road. * Increased confidence that this scheme would greatly improve and address safety concerns and encourage children and the community to walk or cycle, therefore achieving the aim of increasing active travel.   The anticipated outcomes were to increase active travel. | | | | | |
| **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?** | | | | | |
| Improvements have greatly improved connectivity, accessibility and safety of routes to and from Mountain Lane School. Through the delivery of Active Travel design principles, improved safety combined with upgraded infrastructure on all routes has encouraged the utilisation of active modes of travel for pupils, parents and local residents. | | | | | |

**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 |
|  |