

## Chapter 3

### Performance indicators and targets



## CHAPTER 3

### Performance indicators and targets

3.1 Reference has been made in Chapter 2 to the management systems we have put in place during LTP1 to monitor, manage and improve our performance. The rigorous application of those systems was fundamental in our achievement of an ‘excellent’ performance score for our fourth Annual Progress Report, and that level of performance has continued through to the end of the plan period on both core and non-core indicators. The remainder of this chapter deals in turn with our core (Proforma A) and non-core indicators, but before doing so Figure 3.1 summarises our assessment of our overall progress in relation to the criteria DfT have set out in their guidance.

**Figure 3.1 Summary of progress on performance indicators**

|  | Target achieved | Target on track | No clear evidence | Target not achieved | DfT benchmark achieved | Growth | Progress > national average |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Core Indicators</b>                                   |                 |                 |                   |                     |                        |        |                             |
| All KSIs   | Yes             | -               | -                 | -                   | N/A                    | N/A    | Yes                         |
| Child KSIs   | Yes             | -               | -                 | -                   | N/A                    | N/A    | Yes                         |
| Bus Patronage  |                 | Yes             | -                 | -                   | N/A                    | Yes    | N/A                         |
| Cycling  | Yes             | -               | -                 | -                   | N/A                    | Yes    | N/A                         |
| Rural Accessibility                                      | Yes             | -               | -                 | -                   | N/A                    | N/A    | N/A                         |
| <b>Maintenance</b>                                       |                 |                 |                   |                     |                        |        |                             |
| Principal  | Yes             | -               | -                 | -                   | Yes                    | N/A    | N/A                         |
| Non – principal  | Yes             | -               | -                 | -                   | Yes                    | N/A    | N/A                         |
| Unclassified   | Yes             | -               | -                 | -                   | Yes                    | N/A    | N/A                         |
| Category 1 & 2 footways (non core with a DfT bench mark) | Yes             | -               | -                 | -                   | Yes                    | N/A    | N/A                         |
| <b>Non-core</b>  |                 |                 |                   |                     |                        |        |                             |
| 25 Non-core indicators                                   | 22              | -               | 1                 | 2                   | N/A                    | N/A    | N/A                         |

#### Core indicators

##### Summary of overall progress

3.2 Of the eight indicators, seven have been achieved and one, bus patronage, we believe is on track to achieve our long term target of 1% growth per year through to 2010/11, which is in line with the Government’s national target.

3.3 At the outset of LTP1, we had serious concerns about the condition of our roads, brought about by a prolonged period of under-investment. We therefore gave improved maintenance a high priority in our Medium Term Corporate Strategy, to ensure that across the authority as a whole there was sufficient investment set aside to tackle the backlog of work that had built up. As a result, and as set out in Chapter 2, we always spent at or above our revenue settlement level, spent all the capital LTP funds allocated to us for maintenance, transferred a modest

amount of LTP improvement funds to maintenance and allocated some of our own capital resources to this high priority area. As a consequence of this, and our targeted programme of work, all three core maintenance indicators, together with the non-core indicator for category 1 and 2 footpaths, are now at a level below the benchmark specified in DfT guidance. A short commentary on the individual core indicators is given in the paragraphs below.

**3.4 Principal roads (BV223) – Achieved:** Throughout LTP1 we used the deflectograph to measure the condition of our principal roads. The percentage of roads where structural maintenance should be considered has steadily fallen each year from 23.3% in the base year of 1999/00 (compared with the then national average of 14.7%) to 9.2% in 2005/06. This is well ahead of our target of 13%. In line with DfT guidance, in 2005/06 we also measured the condition of our principal roads with SCANNER; this gave a value of 3% which is well below the 12% DfT benchmark.

**3.5 Non-principal roads (BV224a) – Achieved:** Throughout LTP1 we used coarse visual inspections to assess the condition of our non-principal roads. However, there were three changes of definition of this indicator, in 2001/02, 2002/03 and 2003/04, so it has been difficult to track performance. Nevertheless the figure of 11.3% in 2005/06 beat our target of 25% by a large margin. The SCANNER result for 2005/06, at 10%, is also below the 12% DfT benchmark.

**3.6 Unclassified roads (BV224b, BV97b) – Achieved:** Throughout LTP1 we again used coarse visual inspections to assess the condition of these roads, but these also were affected by the changes in definition. Our 2005/06 figure of 8.4% beat our target of 29% by a large margin and is also below the DfT 12% benchmark.

**3.7 Number of bus passenger journeys (BV102) – On track:** Our target is to achieve 1% growth year on year from the base of 2002/03 to 2010/11, in line with the Government's national target to 2010. Although we are well on track to achieve this, our 2005/06 figure of 15,036 million passengers per year is marginally below our milestone figure for the end of LTP1 of 15,144 million. The slight slowing of passenger growth in 2005/06 is almost entirely down to the large fares increases brought about by the unexpectedly large increase in fuel cost during the year. At an average of 10%, fare increases were well above normal inflation. We have classified this indicator as on track primarily because:

- We are unlikely to see further sustained fare increases of the same level
- The very high level of bus accessibility we have achieved for both urban and rural household is well above that achieved by the vast majority of other authorities, giving a sound foundation for further sustained growth
- Growth on the now completed hourly network has been very encouraging, with 6% achieved in 2005/06; we hope to sustain this through further service quality improvements and promotion
- Year on year growth of 16% during LTP1 on our bus corridor improvements will further enhance growth on the hourly network as more corridors are improved during LTP2
- Although the market price for contract bus services has increased faster than general inflation, passenger growth on the hourly network has stabilised subsidy costs, with a fall of 2.4% in the past year.

**3.8** In assessing progress with this indicator it should also be borne in mind that Leicestershire is a largely rural authority. Matching the national target of 1% growth per year can be considered stretching, given that the greatest growth in bus patronage is being achieved in the larger urban areas.

**3.9 Number of cycling trips – Achieved:** We have reversed the decline in cycling of previous years and have achieved almost 1% growth per year for the last three years. This is ahead of our target which was to stabilise cycling levels. The figure of 14,495 exceeds our target of 14,153 trips per week at our 21 automatic count sites by 2.4%.

**3.10 Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) – Achieved:** (See LTP2 paragraphs 2.145-2.147 and 6.16-6.24 for further details of our review of performance, including graphs of casualties against targets) – The figure of 226 KSIs in 2005/06 is 26% below the 1994-98 average and is more than 3% below our milestone target for 2005/06 of 234 which was set to be in line with the Government's target for a 40% reduction by 2010.

**3.11** This indicator, following Government guidance, is for the LTP area only. The area is predominantly rural but includes a high proportion of motorways and trunk roads. The Government's three year review of its road safety strategy highlighted the fact that casualties were falling significantly more slowly in rural areas than in urban areas. Added to this, motorway and trunk road KSI casualties in Leicestershire have been falling at a much slower rate than elsewhere in the country. Both these issues were highlighted in LTP2. In considering our progress against the national average, we consider the following should be taken into account:

- Trunk road KSI casualties, which are largely outside our control and are quite volatile in their numbers, actually rose by over 36% between 2004/05 and 2005/06 (see Figure 3.2) and as a consequence fell by only 5% from the 1994-98 average. (In 2001, at the start of the LTP period, they were in fact 67% higher than the 94-98 average)
- Trunk road and motorway KSI casualties together have risen by over 7% from the 1994-98 average
- Taking a three year rolling average (2003-2005) we had the second lowest KSI casualty rate per 100,000 population of the 13 comparable authorities used by the Audit Commission to benchmark our performance, and 30% less than the average of those authorities. (Based on 2004 – the latest year when comparable information is available for the other authorities)
- As part of our PSA agreement we achieved a 33% reduction in KSI casualties across the whole county for our own roads, despite the network being predominantly rural.

**3.12** We believe therefore that our performance on KSI casualties is in excess of the national average.

**3.13 Number of children killed or seriously injured – Achieved:** In 2004 our child KSI casualties were 73% below the 1994-98 average, the greatest reduction of any shire authority in the country. By then the figure has fallen steadily from 24 in 2000 to only 7 in 2004. With such low numbers, it is inevitable that significant year on year fluctuations are increasingly likely to occur. In 2005 the figure rose to 13 which was still well below our target of 18 (which was set to be in line with the Government's target of a 50% reduction by 2010). The three year rolling average of 10 (based on 2003-2005) is 62% below the 1994-98 average compared with a national average of 43% in 2004 (the equivalent figure) and 49% in 2005. We therefore believe our progress is significantly in excess of the national average.

**3.14 % of rural households within 13 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service – Achieved:** Our target was to achieve a 38% increase in the number of rural households within 13 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service by 2004/05. We achieved this and it compares very favourably with the Government target to achieve a 30% increase by 2010. We now have 76% of rural households with ready access to an hourly or better bus service compared with 55% in 2001/02.

## Non-core indicators

3.15 Our non-core indicators were developed to supplement the core indicators to be a yardstick against which we could measure our progress towards achieving our LTP objectives. Many have been used in this Delivery Report to provide some of the evidence which demonstrates the difference we have made. We have completed Figure 3.2 so that, taken together with Proforma A, we can encapsulate our overall progress across all areas of the LTP. (Figure 3.2 has been produced in the same format as the 2005 APR).

3.16 We have 25 non-core indicators, of which 22 have been achieved, two have been assessed as not achieved and for the remaining one there is no clear evidence, due to the timing of the three yearly Best Value user satisfaction surveys. Two of the targets were assessed by us in the 2005 APR as on track but assessed by DfT as being not on track in the December 2005 settlement. Both were achieved.

3.17 Brief details of the outcomes of all our non-core indicators and targets are given below. All targets have been achieved unless otherwise stated.

### Public transport

3.18 **Bus passenger journeys per year on County Council contract services** have increased from 1.72 million in 2002/03 to 2.71 million in 2005/06. (Target 2.40 million)

3.19 **The average age of the bus fleet** was 7.6 years against our target of 7.5 years or less. This is only a fraction over the 7.5 year target and is well below the eight year target set in the 2003 APR to match the then Government target. We made our target more stretching in the 2004 APR and achieved that over two years. Arriva are introducing a large number of new low-floor buses in summer 2006. We consider this target achieved.

3.20 63% of **bus users were satisfied with public transport information** in 2003/04 in the tri-annual BVPI survey against a target of 76% for 2006/07. Our own Ipsos MORI survey carried out in 2005 showed this had increased to 67% but we will not know until the formal BVPI survey in 2006/07 whether this will lead to the target of 76% being achieved. There is therefore no clear evidence as to whether the 2006/07 target will be achieved.

3.21 We have improved 8 **public transport interchanges** against a target of 8.

3.22 The number of **rail passenger journeys** per year has increased from 2.42 million in 2001/02 to 2.78 million in 2005/06 (Target 2.86 million). Although from 2001/02 to 2004/05 there were steady year on year increases in line with our trajectory towards the target, the more modest increase in 2005/06 has left a shortfall of 3%. This target can not therefore be considered to be achieved. The difficulty we had in meeting our aspirations for local rail travel has been described in Chapter 2.

---

## Travel management

3.23 The number of **schools with formally adopted school travel plans** has increased from 10 in 2001/02 to 117 in 2005/06 (Target 117).

3.24 The number of **major workplaces (>250 people) with travel plans** has increased from 8 in 2001/02 to 28 in 2005/06 (Target 28).

3.25 We support locally 100% of **national campaigns to promote less car use** (Target 100%).

3.26 The number of **free long stay parking places for commuting by car into the six main town centres** reduced from 2244 in 2001/02 to 1911 in 2005/06 (original target was to reduce by 10%).

3.27 The **lorry route plan** was 75% complete in 2001/02 and was 100% complete by 2005/06 (Target 100%).

3.28 The % of all **households within 800 metres walk of an hourly or better bus service** increased from 89% in 2001/02 to 95% in 2005/06 (Target 95%).

## Facilities for people with disabilities

3.29 We have increased the % of **pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people** from 84% in 2001/02 to 98% in 2005/06 (Target 96%).

3.30 The % of the **bus fleet with low-floor level access** has increased from 24% in 2001/02 to 50% in 2005/06 (Target 45%).

3.31 The journeys per week using **complementary public transport services for disabled people** have increased from 1494 in 2002/03 to 1737 in 2005/06 (Target 1700).

## Road safety

3.32 The number of **pedestrians and cyclists killed or seriously injured** decreased from the 1994-98 average of 55 per year to 45 in 2005/06. This is a casualty indicator where the low numbers again lead to significant year on year fluctuation. The target of 40 had been achieved by a significant margin in each of the previous three years, and the three year rolling average (2003-2005) of 32 is well within the 40 target and a reduction of over 40% from the 1994-98 average. Figure 6.5 following paragraph 6.17 of LTP2 shows a trend well within the target. The target has therefore been assessed as achieved.

3.33 The number of **KSI casualties per 100,000 population** has reduced from a 1994-98 average of 68.7 to 49.4 in 2005 (Target 50.6).

3.34 The number of **slight casualties per 100,000 population** has reduced from a 1994-98 average of 467 to 421 in 2005/06 (Target 465).

3.35 The number of **KSI casualties on County roads** (i.e. excluding motorways and trunk roads) has reduced by 33% from a 1994-98 average of 326 to 220 in 2005 (Target 235). We assessed this as on track in the 2005 APR and DfT considered it not to be in their assessment. This is our PSA target, which was made more stretching than the Government's national target, and for which we will receive £880,000 reward funding for its achievement.

3.36 The number of **KSI casualties on trunk roads** has in contrast reduced by only 5% from a 1994-98 average of 59 to 56 in 2005. This is another casualty indicator where the relatively low numbers give rise to significant year on year fluctuations. Although the target of 42 was met in both 2003 and 2004, with KSI casualties of 41 in each of those years, the three year rolling average of 46 is about 10% above the target of 42 so the target cannot therefore be considered to be achieved. The steps we can take to try to address this are given in LTP2 paragraphs 6.35 and 6.36.

3.37 The % of **schools provided with our road safety services** has increased from 77% in 2001/02 to 83% in 2005/06 (Target 81%).

3.38 The % of **Year 6 (10/11 year olds) pupils receiving Bike4Life cycle training** has increased from 52% in 2001/02 to 60% in 2005/06 (Target 60%).

### Maintenance

3.39 The % of **street lamps not working** as planned has reduced from 0.55% in 2001/02 to 0.50% in 2005/06 (Target 0.5%). We assessed this as on track in the 2005 APR but DfT considered it not to be so in their assessment. We had hit problems with lamp life with faulty lamps from a locally based national lamp supplier at the very start of LTP1. This had been explained in earlier APRs. We worked with that supplier on a large number of site trials to help them overcome the problems, which they did to the benefit of the whole industry, and we are again happy to use lamps from that supplier.

3.40 The number of days/km of **traffic controls or closure of traffic sensitive streets** reduced from 1.0 in 2001/02 to 0.3 in 2005/06 (Target 0.4).

3.41 The % of **category 1 and 2 footways** with significant defects in 2005/06 is 7.2% (Target 7.8%). This is well below the 25% DfT benchmark.

3.42 The % of **bridges in County roads below intended carrying capacity** reduced from 3.4% in 2001/02 to 0.6% in 2005/06 (Target 0.9%).

**Proforma A: Progress Against LTP1 Core Indicators**

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Select your LA from the drop down list (Click in yellow box and use the drop down arrow). | Leicestershire |
|---|----------------|

| Core Indicator  | Definitions  | Year                     | Value   | Year Type <sup>3</sup><br>(Enter C for Calendar Year and F for Financial Year) | Actual and Trajectory Data <sup>2</sup> |                |         |         |         |         |         | Has your LA achieved its LTP1 target for this core indicator? | Please indicate if your reported or target figures have changed since you previously reported. | Please outline the methodology and source of data used to calculate your figures. Also include any other relevant information. |   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--------------------------|---------|--|---|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
|   |  |                          |         |  | Year                                    | 2000/01        | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06 |   |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |
| Road Condition (% where structural maintenance should be considered) <sup>4</sup> | (1) principal roads - BV223  | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   | 1999/00 | 23.3%  | F                                       | Year           | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06   | Achieved   |  | BV96 deflectograph surveys (Countywide). Because of a change of definition in 2001/02, trajectory values for 2000/01 and 2001/02 are given as the actual values. The new BV223 indicator is based on SCANNER and the 2005/06 figure is 3%.  |  |  |  |   |
|   |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> | 2005/06 | 13.0%  |   | Actual Figures | 21.5%   | 18.1%   | 16.8%   | 11.6%   | 11.3%   | 9.2%  |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |
|   |  | Units                    |         | Percentage   |   | Trajectories   | 21.5%   | 18.1%   | 17.0%   | 16.0%   | 14.0%   | 13.0%   |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |
|   | (2) non-principal roads - BV224a   | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   | 2000/01 | 10.1%  | F                                       | Year           | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06   | Achieved   |  |   |  | BV97a coarse visual inspection surveys (Countywide). Due to definition changes, no trajectory values shown before 2003/04. The new BV224a indicator is based on SCANNER and the 2005/06 figure is 10%. |  |   |
|   |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> | 2005/06 | 25.0%  |   | Actual Figures | 10.1%   | 11.7%   | 23.5%   | 36.4%   | 29.1%   | 11.3%   |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |
|   |  | Units                    |         | Percentage   |   | Trajectories   |         |         |         | 36.4%   | 31.0%   | 25.0%   |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |
|   | (3) unclassified roads - BV224b (BV97b)  | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   | 2001/02 | 13.1%  | F                                       | Year           | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06   | Achieved   |  |   |  |  |  | BV97b coarse visual inspection surveys (Countywide). Due to definition changes, no trajectory values shown before 2003/04. The new BV224b indicator is a continuation of the former BV97b with no change in methodology |
|   |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> | 2005/06 | 29.0%  |   | Actual Figures |         | 13.1%   | 14.7%   | 37.7%   | 9.6%    | 8.4%  |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |
|   |  | Units                    |         | Percentage   |   | Trajectories   |         |         |         | 37.7%   | 32.0%   | 29.0%   |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |
| Number of bus passenger journeys <sup>5</sup>                                     | Thousands of bus passenger journeys (i.e. boardings) per year in the authority - BV102 | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   | 2002/03 | 14,699   | F                                       | Year           | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06   | On Track   |  | Patronage data provided by bus operators (Countywide). This indicator is continued into LTP2 and in light of the recent excellent patronage increases on the hourly network reported in the Delivery Report we now believe this is still on track to deliver our target of 1% growth per year through to 2010/11. |  |  |  |   |
|   |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> | 2005/06 | 15,144   |   | Actual Figures |         |         | 14,699  | 14,918  | 14,992  | 15,036  |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |
|   |  | Units                    |         |  |   | Trajectories   |         |         | 14,699  | 14,846  | 14,994  | 15,144  |  |  |   |  |  |  |   |

| Core Indicator   | Definitions  |                          | Year            | Value                        | Year Type <sup>3</sup><br>(Enter C for Calendar Year and F for Financial Year) | Actual and Trajectory Data <sup>2</sup> |         |         |         |         |         | Has your LA achieved its LTP1 target for this core indicator? | Please indicate if your reported or target figures have changed since you previously reported. | Please outline the methodology and source of data used to calculate your figures. Also include any other relevant information. |   |
|--|--|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---|--|--|---|
| Number of cycling trips  | Number of cycling trips across the authority or number of cycling trips at a representative number of counting points (please state which)   | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   | 2000            | 14,062                       | C  | Year                                    | 2000    | 2001    | 2002    | 2003    | 2004    | 2005  | Achieved   |  | Continuous automatic counts at 21 cycle track sites (Countywide)          |
|  |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> | 2005            | 14,153                       |  | Actual Figures                          | 14,062  | 14,244  | 14,083  | 14,224  | 14,322  | 14,495  |  |  |   |
|  |  | Units                    |                 | Trips/week at 21 count sites |  | Trajectories                            | 14,062  | 14,093  | 14,123  | 14,153  | 14,153  | 14,153  |  |  |   |
| Number of deaths and serious injuries (all ages) <sup>6</sup>                                | Number of people killed or seriously injured on roads in the authority   | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   | 1994-98 average | 305                          | C  | Year                                    | 2000    | 2001    | 2002    | 2003    | 2004    | 2005  | Achieved   |  | Police accident reports for all roads including motorways (LTP area only) |
|  |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> | 2005            | 234                          |  | Actual Figures                          | 281     | 300     | 268     | 232     | 232     | 226   |  |  |   |
|  |  | Units                    |                 | Number of people             |  | Trajectories                            | 284     | 274     | 264     | 254     | 244     | 234   |  |  |   |
| Number of children killed and seriously injured <sup>6</sup>                                 | Number of children (aged less than 16) killed or seriously injured in the authority  | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   | 1994-98 average | 26                           | C  | Year                                    | 2000    | 2001    | 2002    | 2003    | 2004    | 2005  | Achieved   |  | Police accident reports for all roads including motorways (LTP area only) |
|  |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> |                 | 18                           |  | Actual Figures                          | 24      | 29      | 17      | 10      | 7       | 13  |  |  |   |
|  |  | Units                    |                 | Number of children           |  | Trajectories                            | 24      | 23      | 22      | 21      | 20      | 18  |  |  |   |
| Light rail passenger journeys <sup>7</sup>   | Thousands of light rail passengers per year  | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   |                 |                              |  | Year                                    |         |         |         |         |         |   |  |  |   |
|  |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> |                 |                              |  | Actual Figures                          |         |         |         |         |         |   |  |  |   |
|  |  | Units                    |                 |                              |  | Trajectories                            |         |         |         |         |         |   |  |  |   |
| % of rural households within 13 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service <sup>7</sup> | % of rural <sup>8</sup> households within 13 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service or % of rural <sup>8</sup> households within 800 metres of an hourly or better bus service (please state which) | Base Data <sup>1</sup>   | 2001/02         | 55%                          | F  | Year                                    | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06   | Achieved   |  | Rural population statistics and mapping of bus routes. (Countywide)       |
|  |  | Target Data <sup>2</sup> | 2004/05         | 76%                          |  | Actual Figures                          |         | 55.0%   | 61.0%   | 67.0%   | 76.0%   | 76.0%   |  |  |   |
|  |  | Units                    |                 |                              |  | Trajectories                            |         | 55.0%   | 62.0%   | 69.0%   | 76.0%   | 76.0%   |  |  |   |

NB - Please refer to the accompanying guidance for descriptions of footnotes.

FIGURE 3.2 - NON-CORE INDICATORS PRO-FORMA

| Local Objectives contained in LTP         | Local Performance Indicators contained in LTP                       | Local targets or outcomes contained in LTP | Baseline Data      | Actual Data       |                   |                   |                   |                   | On track / not on track? | Source of data                                     | National target to which indicator and local target link |
|---|---|--|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
|   |   |  |                    | 2001/02 (or 2001) | 2002/03 (or 2002) | 2003/04 (or 2003) | 2004/05 (or 2004) | 2005/06 (or 2005) |                          |  |  |
| <b>APR4 SHARED PRIORITY - CONGESTION</b>  |   |  |                    |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                          |  |  |
| Increase bus passenger journeys           | Bus passenger journeys per year on County Council contract services | 2005/06 <b>2.40m</b>                       | 2002/03<br>1.72m   |                   | 1.72m             | 2.17m             | 2.75              | 2.71              | Achieved                 | Bus operators (whole County)                       | More bus use and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OII/3 & OIII/7)   |
|   | Average age of bus fleet  | 2006<br><b>7.5 years or less</b>           | 2001/02<br>7.2 yrs | 7.2 yrs           | 7.6 yrs           | 6.3 yrs           | 6.9 yrs           | 7.6               | Achieved                 | Main operators (90% of fleet) (County + City)      | More bus use and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OII/3 & OIII/7)   |
| More awareness of PT travel opportunities | % of users satisfied with public transport information (BV103)      | 2006/07<br><b>76% satisfied</b>            | 2000/01<br>69%     | n/a               | n/a               | 63%               | n/a               | n/a               | No clear evidence        | Local BVPI user satisfaction survey (whole County) | More bus use and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OII/3 & OIII/7)   |
| Make PT interchange more effective        | Number of improved interchanges introduced                          | 2005/06 <b>8 total</b>                     | 2000/01<br>Zero    | 2 total           | 2 total           | 4 total           | 6 total           | 8 total           | Achieved                 | County public transport records (whole County)     | More bus use and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OII/3 & OIII/7)   |
| Increase rail passenger journeys          | Passenger journeys per year   | 2005/06 <b>2.86m</b>                       | 2000/01<br>2.34m   | 2.42m             | 2.56m             | 2.63m             | 2.75m             | 2.78m             | Not achieved             | Train operating companies (whole County)           | Improve trains and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OI/2 & OIII/7)  |
| Promote fewer car arrivals at schools     | Number (and %) of schools with School Travel Plans (STPs)           | 2005/06<br><b>117 STPs total</b>           | 1999/00<br>none    | 10 total (3.3%)   | 24 total (7.9%)   | 36 total (11.8%)  | 77 total (25.3%)  | 117 total (38.5%) | Achieved                 | STP co-ordination records (whole County)           | More bus use and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OII/3 & OIII/7)   |

| Local Objectives contained in LTP   | Local Performance Indicators contained in LTP  | Local targets or outcomes contained in LTP      | Baseline Data          | Actual Data       |                   |                   |                   |                   | On track / not on track? | Source of data                                      | National target to which indicator and local target link |
|---|--|---|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
|   |  |   |                        | 2001/02 (or 2001) | 2002/03 (or 2002) | 2003/04 (or 2003) | 2004/05 (or 2004) | 2005/06 (or 2005) |                          |   |  |
| Reduce car use generated by workplaces                                    | Number of major workplaces (>250 people) with adopted WTPs                               | 2005/06<br><b>28 WTPs total</b>                 | 1999/00<br>none        | 8 total           | 13 total          | 17 total          | 22 total          | 28 total          | Achieved                 | WTP records (whole County)                          | More bus use and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OII/3 & OIII/7)   |
| Promote less car use generally  | Proportion of national campaigns supported locally                                       | <b>Each year support all relevant campaigns</b> | 2000/01<br>75%         | 100%              | 100%              | 100%              | 100%              | 100%              | Achieved                 | Travel awareness campaign records                   | More bus use and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OII/3 & OIII/7)   |
| Limit the growth in commuting by car                                      | Public free long stay parking spaces for commuting by car into the six main town centres | 2005/06<br><b>1911 spaces</b>                   | 1999/00<br>2244 spaces | 2244              | 2244              | 1911              | 1911              | 1911              | Achieved                 | Public parking on and off-street (six main centres) | More bus use and less CO <sub>2</sub> (OII/3 & OIII/7)   |
| <b>APR4 SHARED PRIORITY – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS INCLUDING AIR QUALITY</b> |  |   |                        |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                          |   |  |
| More efficient and sustainable freight on suitable routes                 | Extent of implementation of lorry control plan   | 2005/06 <b>100%</b>                             | 1999/00<br>60%         | 75%               | 85%               | 90%               | 95%               | 100%              | Achieved                 | Lorry control records (whole County)                | No link to DfT national targets                          |
| <b>APR4 SHARED PRIORITY – ACCESSIBILITY</b>                               |  |   |                        |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                          |   |  |
| Improve social inclusion via public transport availability                | % of all households within 800m walk of an hourly or better bus service                  | 2004/05 <b>95%</b>                              | 2001/02<br>89%         | 89%               | 90.5%             | 93%               | 95%               | 95%               | Achieved                 | Mapping (800m walk distance) (whole County)         | Increase bus use (OII/3)                                 |

| Local Objectives contained in LTP  | Local Performance Indicators contained in LTP   | Local targets or outcomes contained in LTP | Baseline Data                  | Actual Data       |                   |                   |                   |                   | On track / not on track? | Source of data  | National target to which indicator and local target link |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
|  |   |  |                                | 2001/02 (or 2001) | 2002/03 (or 2002) | 2003/04 (or 2003) | 2004/05 (or 2004) | 2005/06 (or 2005) |                          |   |  |
| Remove barriers to movement by disabled people                                 | % of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people (BV165)                   | 2005/06 <b>96%</b>                         | 1999/00<br>75%                 | 84%               | 86%               | 85%               | 96%               | 98%               | Achieved                 | County records of pedestrian crossings (whole County) | No link to DfT national targets                          |
|  | % of bus fleet low-floor for level access and faster boarding                           | 2005/06 <b>45%</b>                         | June 02<br>24%                 | 24%               | 33%               | 36%               | 45%               | 50%               | Achieved                 | Main operators (90% of fleet) (County + City)         | Increase bus use (OII/3)                                 |
|  | Journeys per week using complementary PT services for disabled people                   | 2005/06<br><b>1700 journeys per week</b>   | 2002/03<br>1494                |                   | 1494              | 1573              | 1750              | 1737              | Achieved                 | County public transport records (whole County)        | Increase bus use (OII/3)                                 |
| <b>APR4 SHARED PRIORITY – ROAD SAFETY</b>                                      |   |  |                                |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                          |   |  |
| Reduce road casualties<br><br>(includes figures for trunk roads and motorways) | No. of pedestrians + cyclists (vulnerable road users) killed or seriously injured (KSI) | Calendar year 2005 <b>40</b>               | 1994/98 average<br>55 per year | 2001<br>48        | 2002<br>24        | 2003<br>23        | 2004<br>28        | 2005<br>45        | Achieved                 | Police reports (LTP area only)                        | Fewer KSI casualties (OIII/5)                            |
|  | No of casualties per 100k of population KSI - all road users combined                   | Calendar year 2005 <b>50.6</b>             | 1994/98 average<br>68.7        | 2001<br>62.9      | 2002<br>59.6      | 2003<br>48.4      | 2004<br>48.8      | 2005<br>49.4      | Achieved                 | Police reports and population figures (whole County)  | Fewer KSI casualties (OIII/5)                            |
|  | No of casualties per 100k of population slight injury - all road users combined         | Calendar year 2005 <b>465</b>              | 1994/98 average<br>467         | 2001<br>489       | 2002<br>467       | 2003<br>447       | 2004<br>438       | 2005<br>421       | Achieved                 | Police reports and population figures (whole County)  | No link to DfT national targets                          |

| Local Objectives contained in LTP  | Local Performance Indicators contained in LTP                                     | Local targets or outcomes contained in LTP | Baseline Data       | Actual Data       |                   |                   |                   |                   | On track / not on track? | Source of data                                 | National target to which indicator and local target link |
|--|---|--|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
|  |   |  |                     | 2001/02 (or 2001) | 2002/03 (or 2002) | 2003/04 (or 2003) | 2004/05 (or 2004) | 2005/06 (or 2005) |                          |  |  |
| Local PSA (Public Service Agreement) for road casualty reduction agreed with DfT in 2003 | Number of casualties KSI on County roads (i.e excludes trunk roads and motorways) | Calendar year 2005 <b>235</b>              | 1994/98 average 326 | 2001 277          | 2002 247          | 2003 221          | 2004 240          | 2005 220          | Achieved                 | Police reports (whole County)                  | Fewer KSI casualties (OIII/5)                            |
|  | Number of casualties KSI on trunk roads but not including motorways               | Calendar year 2005 <b>42</b>               | 1994/98 average 59  | 2001 70           | 2002 69           | 2003 41           | 2004 41           | 2005 56           | Not Achieved             | Police reports (whole County)                  | Fewer KSI casualties (OIII/5)                            |
| Promote road safety through training, education and awareness                            | % of schools provided with road safety services                                   | 2005/06 <b>81%</b>                         | 1999/00 79%         | 77%               | 81%               | 81%               | 81%               | 83%               | Achieved                 | Road safety training records (whole County)    | Fewer KSI casualties (OIII/5)                            |
|  | % of year 6 (10/11 year old) pupils receiving cycle training                      | 2005/06 <b>60%</b>                         | 1999/00 50%         | 52%               | 55%               | 54%               | 59%               | 60%               | Achieved                 | Road safety training records (whole County)    | Fewer KSI casualties (OIII/5)                            |
| Maintain and improve street lighting   | % of street lamps not working as planned (former BV98)                            | 2005/06 <b>0.50%</b>                       | 1999/00 0.55%       | 0.55%             | 0.82%             | 1.00%             | 0.65%             | 0.50%             | Achieved                 | Street lighting fault records (whole County)   | Fewer KSI casualties (OIII/5)                            |
| <b>MAINTENANCE</b>   |   |  |                     |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                          |  |  |
| Safe and efficient movement of people and goods without inhibiting walking and cycling   | Days/km of traffic controls or closure of traffic sensitive roads (BV100)         | 2005/06 <b>0.4 days/km</b>                 | 1999/00 1.0 days/km | 1.0               | 0.8               | 0.4               | 0.2               | 0.3               | Achieved                 | Utility and maint'nce records (whole County)   | No link to DfT national targets                          |
|  | % of Category 1 and 2 footways with significant defects (BV187)                   | 2005/06 <b>7.8%</b>                        | 2002/03 1.4%        |                   | 1.4%              | 9.6%              | 8.2%              | 7.2%              | Achieved                 | Visual inspection suveys (whole County)        | No link to DfT national targets                          |
| Fewer bridges needing repair or strengthening  | % of bridges on County roads below intended carrying capacity                     | 2005/06 <b>0.9%</b>                        | 1999/00 4.7%        | 3.4%              | 3.5%              | 2.6%              | 1.0%              | 0.6%              | Achieved                 | Bridge records for spans > 1.5m (whole County) | No link to DfT national targets                          |