

Table 2 – Local Transport Grants Scheme Details

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--------|-------------------|---|
| Grant* | Safe Routes in Communities | | | | |
| Scheme Name | 20mph Zones on Strategic Routes | | | | |
| Year of Completion* | 2017-18 | | | | |
| SCHEME COSTS AND FUNDING | | | | | |
| Estimated total scheme cost at design stage | £80000 | Actual total scheme cost at scheme completion | £80000 | Difference | 0 |
| Reasons for difference between estimated and actual total scheme cost | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Total Welsh Government funding allocated | £72000 | Total Welsh Government funding claimed | £72000 | 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, and representatives from Sustrans, visited Victoria School, during the 12-months prior to the SRIC's bid being made in order 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? |
| When possible the provision of controlled crossing points, such as the pedestrian crossing installed as part of this project encourages those safe crossing points to be used rather than the random crossing of busy highways as was experienced prior to this work. |
| 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 school and pedestrian routes to it to the benefit of 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. Local residents also appreciated the works undertaken, and the benefits in reducing traffic speeds, within their streets. |
| 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 |
| 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Estimated Personal Injury collision reduction at application | | |
| Estimated reduction of Fatal collisions | Estimated reduction of Serious collisions | Estimated reduction of Slight collisions |
| 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Actual Personal Injury collisions post scheme delivery (3 years data) | | |
| Number of Fatal collisions | Number of Serious collisions | Number of Slight collisions |
| 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Performance against estimated collision reduction (+/- estimate pa) | | |
| Number of Fatal collisions | Number of Serious collisions | Number of Slight collisions |
| 0 | +2 | +1 |
| Damage only collisions pre scheme (3 years data) if applicable | | |
| Number of damage only collisions | | |
| Data not held | | |
| Actual damage only collisions post scheme delivery (3 years data) if applicable | | |
| Number of damage only collisions | | |
| Data not 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 | 0 | 11 |
| Estimated Personal Injury casualty reduction at application | | |
| Estimated reduction of Fatal casualties | Estimated reduction of Serious casualties | Estimated reduction of Slight casualties |
| 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Actual Personal Injury casualties post scheme delivery (3 years data) | | |
| Number of Fatal casualties | Number of Serious casualties | Number of Slight casualties |
| 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Performance against estimated casualty reduction (+/- estimate pa) | | |
| Number of Fatal casualties | Number of Serious casualties | Number of Slight casualties |
| 0 | +3 | -2 |
| 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 | 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 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 |

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 |