

Table 2 – Local Transport Grants Scheme Details

Grant*	Safe Routes in Communities				
Scheme Name	20mph Zones on Strategic Routes				
Year of Completion*	2016-17				
SCHEME COSTS AND FUNDING					
Estimated total scheme cost at design stage	£88000	Actual total scheme cost at scheme completion	£88000	Difference	0
Reasons for difference between estimated and actual total scheme cost					
Total Welsh Government funding allocated	£79200	Total Welsh Government funding claimed	£79200	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?					
Road Safety Officers of Wrexham County Borough Council have visited those 7 schools, included within this particular programme, within the County Borough over the past 12-months to discuss and promote road safety matters with teachers and pupils alike.					
The objectives of these exercises was to gain a valuable in-sight into the issues those pupils experience when getting to and from school, and in partnership with Wrexham County Borough Council, produce various options and recommendations which will help alleviate some of those issues.					
The outcome of these discussions, helped support this particular bid and determined which alternative transport methods, should be used rather than the car, such as walking and cycling and so encourage healthier lifestyle choice					

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 the schools included within this bid 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?
Formal consultations were undertaken with residents, councillors, community council, in all of the communities prior to works commencing on site to inform all stakeholders of the proposed works at all of the sites included within this particular bid
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 those affected communities as a whole
What lessons have been learnt for future schemes?
The introduction of traffic calming features, particularly outside schools, have been well received as have the 20mph zones and the use of interactive signage
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, but this is due to the location of these schools on those strategic traffic routes. However

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 of this nature.

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		

NB.

As this bid relates to 6 individual locations it is difficult to determine the effectiveness of the works in relation to accident statistics.

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	Serious casualties from Vulnerable groups (older	Slight casualties from Vulnerable groups (older

drivers, children, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian)	drivers, children, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian)	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
None taken