

4 Templates

Table 1 – Local Transport Grants Contact Information

Local authority	Wrexham County Borough 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	<div>Redacted - Personal Data</div>
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	Plas Madoc Community Project				
Year of Completion*	2015-16				
SCHEME COSTS AND FUNDING					
Estimated total scheme cost at design stage	£55800	Actual total scheme cost at scheme completion	55800	Difference	0
Reasons for difference between estimated and actual total scheme cost					
Total Welsh Government funding allocated	49600	Total Welsh Government funding claimed	49600	Difference	0
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?					
It is recognised that by not walking or cycling whilst young, children become car dependant, and eventually as adults find it difficult to use an alternative mode of transport. It is essential that children be given the opportunity to use alternative modes of transport, and so reduce their reliance and the need, to be driven to school. It must also be recognised that with the provision of safe quality facilities for walking and cycling, children can form environmentally and healthy habits early in life.					
Engagement					
How did you engage with stakeholders in the planning and design of your scheme?					
Discussions were held with parents and pupils, to discuss access to the school and their desire to get to school either on foot or by pedal cycle. It became apparent through those discussions that the main obstacles they face are the lack of safe crossing places, the speed of vehicles within the area and the parking of vehicles on pavements obstructing pedestrian movements.					
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?
The placing of traffic calming schemes outside schools were welcomed by all stakeholders
SCHEME DELIVERY (WeITAG Stage 4)
What outputs were delivered? <i>E.g. X metres of bus lane,</i>
We provided a safer area outside Rhosymedre School for all road users
What worked well?
The scheme was well received within the community
What worked less well?
N/A
How did you engage with stakeholders in the delivery of your scheme?
A formal consultation was undertaken with residents, councillors, community council, Rhosymedre School (incl of Govenors) and other stakeholders prior to construction on site informing them of the proposed works
Summary of any relevant events that occurred DURING implementation and any changes in context <i>e.g. fuel prices, land-use, travel patterns, weather events</i>
The works progressed without interference from outside influences
Impact of engagement and/ or any relevant events on Scheme Delivery
The proposed works were welcomed by the community as a whole
What lessons have been learnt for future schemes?
The introduction of traffic calming features, particularly outside schools, have been well received
SCHEME OUTCOMES (WeITAG Stage 5)
What were the anticipated outcomes? <i>E.g. X% increase in active travel</i>
We anticipated a greater number of pupils walking and cycling to school and a reduction in accidents within the area
What are the realised outcomes? <i>Please quantify where possible</i>
In the years since the completion of the scheme no great increases have been witnessed in pupils and parents attitudes in getting to school
How did you engage stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation of your scheme?
Site visits to determine numbers walking and cycling to school
Summary of any relevant events that occurred AFTER implementation and any changes in context <i>e.g. fuel prices, land-use, travel patterns, weather events</i>
N/A
Impact of engagement and/ or any relevant events on Scheme Outcomes
No particular outcomes to report

What lessons have been learnt for future schemes?
Public engagement is essential when proposing works such as this.

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
0	1	5
Estimated Personal Injury collision reduction at application		
Estimated reduction of Fatal collisions	Estimated reduction of Serious collisions	Estimated reduction of Slight collisions
0	1	2
Actual Personal Injury collisions post scheme delivery (3 years data)		
Number of Fatal collisions	Number of Serious collisions	Number of Slight collisions
0	1	2
Performance against estimated collision reduction (+/- estimate pa)		
Number of Fatal collisions	Number of Serious collisions	Number of Slight collisions
0	+1	-1
Damage only collisions pre scheme (3 years data) if applicable		
Number of damage only collisions		
No data held		
Actual damage only collisions post scheme delivery (3 years data) if applicable		
Number of damage only collisions		
No data held		

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
0	1	6
Estimated Personal Injury casualty reduction at application		
Estimated reduction of Fatal casualties	Estimated reduction of Serious casualties	Estimated reduction of Slight casualties
0	1	2
Actual Personal Injury casualties post scheme delivery (3 years data)		
Number of Fatal casualties	Number of Serious casualties	Number of Slight casualties
0	1	1
Performance against estimated casualty reduction (+/- estimate pa)		
Number of Fatal casualties	Number of Serious casualties	Number of Slight casualties
0	+1	-5
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:
0	0	5
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:
0	0	2
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:
0	0	0

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:
0	1	1

Table 5 – Road Safety Capital Scheme Outcomes – Safety Audits

Please provide details of any road safety audits undertaken outlining observations and actions taken
None taken