

## Chapter 4

### Delivery of LTP strategies



# CHAPTER 4

## Delivery of LTP strategies

### Introduction

4.1 This chapter describes how we have delivered our LTP strategy during LTP1. In line with the Delivery Report guidance, we have focussed on five of our key delivery areas. For each area, we have provided a brief outline of what was planned when we prepared LTP1 and then explained what we have delivered during the five year period, appraising this delivery against the minimum and good characteristics of LTPs as set out in the Government's guidance for the first LTPs.

4.2 In line with Delivery Report guidance, we have appraised in Figures 4.1 to 4.3:

- Public transport strategy
- Road safety strategy
- Sustainability of transport policies.

4.3 And from the remaining delivery areas identified, we have selected to appraise in Figures 4.4 and 4.5:

- Principal road maintenance and bridge strengthening strategy
- Disability issues and social inclusion.

4.4 These two have been chosen because of their importance to the local area and particular significance to the LTP strategy.

4.5 In each case, we identify for each delivery area:

- The delivery benchmark minimum requirements and characteristics of strong delivery
- What we planned to deliver
- What we did deliver during the period of LTP1
- An explanation for how we changed delivery during the LTP1 period.

4.6 In setting out what we planned to deliver we have taken account of the Best Value Reviews completed after LTP1 was developed, and the review of targets, both described in Chapter 2.



Figure 4.1 – Implementation of public transport strategy

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>1. Bus Strategy:</p> <p>a) Substantial improvements to services and networks across the LTP area.</p>	<p>To improve access to everyday facilities including employment, education, shopping, leisure and health care, for all sections of the community, but particularly for those who do not have access to a car.</p> <p>This would be achieved through the implementation of the following actions within the bus strategy:</p> <p>Improvements to commercial services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drive up quality standards. (Specifically addressed in (b) below)</li> <li>• Develop Quality Bus Partnerships (specifically addressed in (b) below)</li> <li>• Implement bus improvements through corridor partnership schemes (specifically addressed in (c) below).</li> </ul> <p>Supported road passenger transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop network of contract bus services</li> <li>• Respond to changes in commercial bus services</li> <li>• Guarantee minimum levels of service to rural areas.</li> </ul> <p>Supported fully accessible transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with communities to develop appropriate transport schemes (specifically addressed in (d) below)</li> <li>• Develop transport schemes for</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>This has been achieved with our partners through successful implementation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hourly bus network</li> <li>• Public transport interchange improvements</li> <li>• Demand responsive transport</li> <li>• Partnerships and service quality improvements including corridor and bus stop infrastructure improvements</li> <li>• Public transport information improvements</li> <li>• Concessionary travel.</li> </ul> <p>Our recent 2006 Ipsos MORI survey indicated that 71% of users who expressed a satisfaction rating, were satisfied with local bus services overall.</p>	<p><b>Public Transport Best Value Review</b></p> <p>– this required a comprehensive and challenging assessment of bus provision and usage, including a full review of the impact of rural bus grant. One outcome was development of new criteria to underpin support of local bus services, including those supported by rural bus grant, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a closer fit to the County Council's corporate objectives and the wishes of customers</li> <li>• Provide better value for money, particularly in the rural areas, where rural bus grant services can be better integrated into the network</li> <li>• Use extra funding now available to produce a step change in the access opportunities provided by the bus services network</li> <li>• Provide a clear mechanism for service adjustments to be made if necessary to keep expenditure in line with a cash-limited budget.</li> </ul> <p>Bus network development is centred on increased service levels, development of commercial services through quality bus partnerships, associated infrastructure and interchange improvements and better promotion of network services. Central to this was development of the hourly bus network.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
	people with mobility impairments (specifically addressed in (d) below).		<b>Integrated Passenger Transport Unit (IPTU)</b> An independent review of passenger transport procurement was completed in late 2004. This review made a number of recommendations, including the development of a new integrated transport unit to procure and manage passenger transport on behalf of the authority. The new unit, which was operational in April 2006, will generate cost savings and efficiency gains in passenger transport and fleet management.
b) Evidence of partnership between authority and operators to promote and improve key services  Major outputs delivered by partnerships	Drive up quality standards, develop quality bus partnerships and implement bus improvements through corridor partnership schemes (corridor schemes addressed in (c) below)	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>The Quality Bus Partnerships, covering Central Leicestershire, Loughborough and Hinckley, meet on a quarterly basis and provide forums for identifying priorities for action throughout the commercial bus network. We hold an annual operator forum, supported by three forum sub groups in the remainder of the year.</p> <p>The Quality Bus Partnerships produce many outputs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major bus corridor improvements</li> <li>• Development of real-time information</li> <li>• Service quality standards including driver training</li> <li>• Low floor buses</li> <li>• Marketing.</li> </ul> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Leicester to Loughborough-Shepshed corridor improvement, including higher frequency, new low-floor buses, raised kerbs and new bus shelters, comprehensive promotion and before and after market research. The result was a 26% increase in patronage in the first year</li> <li>• Our joint information strategy, with all partners contributing to the production of bus stops displays, timetable plans, guides and leaflets, as well as supporting the Traveline service</li> <li>• Road improvements to help buses, a recent example being a major improvement at the Narborough Road / Braunstone Lane junction on the edge of Leicester, where input from the bus companies in the design process resulted in realignment</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>of bus priority lanes in the scheme, giving improved bus journey times without increasing delays for other vehicles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The star trak partnership to introduce real time information, and selective bus priorities at traffic signals, on main routes countywide. The substantial progress with this is detailed earlier in the report</li> <li>• Working with other regional authorities, the bus companies and Nottingham East Midlands Airport (NEMA) to produce substantial improvements in bus access to the airport. With funding from Kickstart and emda we are now close to providing frequent round-the-clock links from all the main urban areas.</li> </ul> <p>Our East and West Leicestershire Rural Transport Partnerships have been set up with the district councils, the Countryside Agency and various voluntary sector transport bodies. The partnerships have contributed substantially to the development of our innovatory rural transport services, detailed earlier in the report.</p> <p>Our rural bus shelters initiative involves joint investment in new bus shelters with district and parish councils. This initiative is making a significant impact on the number and quality of rural bus shelters, with over 60 funded since the programme started in 1999/00.</p> <p>We have worked in partnership with bus companies and developers to secure substantial public transport improvements in new development, including star-trak equipment, subsidy for new bus services and the provision of new bus-only links.</p> <p>The inspectors for our Best Value Review commented very favourably on our partnership work, finding that partners identified the County Council as adding significant value through the application of its expertise and that it has a long history of successful cross-boundary working with surrounding local authorities.</p>	
c) Evidence of the LTP1 investment made in bus priority measures delivering monitored benefits to bus passengers cost effectively	Drive up quality standards, develop quality bus partnerships and implement bus improvements through corridor partnership schemes	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>As an example, our Leicester-Loughborough-Shepshed Quality Bus Corridor service, described above, produced a 26% increase in patronage in the first year after completion, with overwhelmingly positive customer response.</p> <p>Overall, patronage on our five corridor improvements increased by an average of over 16% per year.</p>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
d) Substantial integration of conventional bus services with health and community transport and the voluntary sector	Supported fully accessible transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with communities to develop appropriate transport schemes</li> <li>• Develop transport schemes for people with mobility impairments.</li> </ul>	<b>Strategy implemented as planned</b> Details of some of the many measures implemented are detailed in Chapter 2. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand-responsive transport including shared taxi services, taxi buses, the village transport scheme and rural Dial a Ride, often linking with services on the hourly bus network</li> <li>• Support for voluntary groups to provide special services for those who have difficulty using conventional bus services, with full countywide coverage achieved; services often provided in an integrated way with others supported by social services and health authorities</li> <li>• Concessionary travel enhanced to offer higher value of travel tokens in rural areas and passes available for use on social car schemes. Scheme entitlements considerably exceeded the specified minimum, including countywide and cross-border travel</li> <li>• Transport to Health project, giving joint planning of transport to clinics and doctors' surgeries, as described in Chapter 2</li> <li>• Rural Rider project providing integrated transport in a rural area east of Leicester</li> <li>• Integrated Passenger Transport Unit established for integrated management of all public, education and social services transport.</li> </ul>	The Public Transport Best Value review supported this, calling for a wide range of improvements to rural and community transport, with integration within and without the Council.
e) Achievement of local outcome indicators for public transport  Delivery of stretching local outcome indicators	a) % of households within 800m walk of an hourly or better bus service b) Increase annual journeys on County Council contract services c) Maintain the average age of our bus fleet at 7.5 yrs or less d) Improved interchanges e) Increase % of bus fleet low floor for level access and faster boarding f) Increase journeys per week using complementary PT services for disabled people.	<b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b> (See Chapter 3 for further details of our progress towards targets). Referring to the letter targets in the column to the left: a) Achieved target of 95% of people in Leicestershire having access to at least an hourly bus service in November 2004. We believe this to be one of the highest levels of bus access in the country. We increased by nearly 40% the number of rural households with such access b) We met our target one year early, increasing passenger on our contract services from 1.72m in 2002/03 to 2.71m in 2005/06 c) Our figure of 7.6 years in 2005/06 narrowly missed the target but improved on the Government target at the outset of LTP1 of 8 years d) Target achieved with 8 improved interchanges e) Achieved our target of 45% in 2004/05, from 24% in 2001/02.	c) On track in the previous 2 years and will be again in 2006/07 following new acquisitions by Arriva.

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>By 2005/06 50% of the bus fleet had low floor access</p> <p>f) Met target one year early, with an actual figure of 1,750 journeys per week in 2004/05.</p>	
f) Delivery of substantial increases in park and ride, at least equivalent to the proposals in the LTP1 strategy	No specific proposals contained in LTP1.	<p><b>Strategy not achieved</b></p> <p>Proposals were identified in Central Leicestershire LTP1, described in the Delivery Report for that LTP and briefly outlined in Chapter 2 of this Report.</p> <p>During LTP1 we successfully negotiated with developers for a second site on the A6 at Birstall, north of Leicester. This is expected to become operational shortly after the LTP2 period.</p>	The refusal of a major scheme bid for the Leicester West park and ride scheme in Central Leicestershire undermined our strategy for this
<p>2. Implementation of Passenger Rail Strategy</p> <p>a) Delivery of substantially improved integration in which the local authority is a key partner</p> <p>b) Delivery of substantial outputs by the local authority at a level at least consistent with the LTP1 strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance services on Leicester to Nuneaton Corridor with a new station at Blaby (for action within Central Leicestershire LTP1)</li> <li>• Seek a way forward to progress Ivanhoe Stage 2</li> <li>• Ongoing discussions with Midland Mainline to provide a train service to a new station at Kibworth and longer term aspirations for a new station at East Goscote (for action in Central Leicestershire LTP1)</li> <li>• Move towards train frequencies of at least 15 minute frequency on lines radiating from Leicester to Hinckley, Loughborough, Melton Mowbray and Market Harborough</li> <li>• Co-operative work with train operating companies to improve interchange at stations.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy not fully implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Our aspirations for higher frequency train services and an increased number of stations have not been achieved. The Strategic Rail Authority, on the basis of a series of route utilisation studies, made clear that it saw best value from giving inter-city and freight services priority for use of limited network capacity rather than local passenger services, except in the largest conurbations. We were not in a position to influence that conclusion.</p> <p>We have continued develop the Ivanhoe stage 1 service from Leicester to Loughborough, with further marketing, led by us, and the funding by us of a new station car park at Syston contributing to an increase of patronage. We have not, however, been able to progress the aspiration for the Ivanhoe stage 2 service between Leicester and Burton. It became clear soon after the start of LTP1 that costs in the rail industry had risen to such an extent that the project no longer offered value for money. We have kept it under review but the conclusion has not changed. We will continue to keep the project under review, in case future opportunities arise.</p> <p>During LTP1 we were in regular contact with the rail industry through many local contacts and, more formally, through our membership of the East Midlands Rail Forum. We met regularly with Central Trains and the DfT to discuss, amongst other issues, the ongoing support of the Ivanhoe stage 1 service between Leicester and Loughborough and the remapping of the East Midlands rail franchise due to be awarded in 2007. We were in regular contact with Midland Mainline over many matters including the Parkway Rail Station at Ratcliffe on Soar.</p>	<p>Public Transport Best Value Review broadly supported the LTP1 strategy but reflected the growing awareness that substantial improvements to service frequency and station provision were unlikely to be achievable in the short to medium term.</p> <p>Since then the problems in the rail industry have underlined that view and have been the fundamental reason why we have been unable to implement our strategy fully.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>We have invested substantially to improve the rail/bus interchange at Loughborough, with improved information, shelter and star-trak real-time information, in partnership with the borough council, the train companies and Kinchbus. As a result there are now around 7 commercially run buses an hour from the station to the town centre and beyond, with through ticketing available for some journeys. The interchange has attracted substantial patronage and is highly successful. We have undertaken similar initiatives, but to a smaller scale, at other Leicestershire stations.</p>	
<p>3. Role of taxis and Private Hire Vehicles</p> <p>Substantial innovative use of taxis as part of the wider transport system and substantial integration of policies for taxis into other transport policies</p>	<p>a) Increase role of taxis as a cost-effective way of providing public transport services in areas of low potential patronage.</p> <p>b) Liaise with the district councils to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market is appropriately supplied in urban and rural areas</li> <li>• Taxi rank provision is appropriate and well related to interchange points with other forms of public transport.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>a) As demonstrated in section 1 (d) above we have successfully introduced innovative demand-responsive services particularly suited to places where there is limited demand including taxi buses and shared taxi services. Projects include the Misterton with Walcote and Hallaton taxi voucher schemes, both of which were cited as examples of best practice by the Countryside Agency. We now have a number of years' experience of running taxibus services and have well-established best practice.</p> <p>Our concessionary travel scheme has been specially tailored to meet the needs of those in rural areas, who can choose special taxi vouchers instead of a bus pass if they rely on taxis for transport. Taxi services forming part of our rural transport network accept our bus passes, and disabled people can opt for taxi vouchers if they rely on this form of transport, as well as being able to travel at half fare on all our community transport schemes.</p> <p>b) During LTP1 we successfully worked with our district councils to integrate taxis within our other transport policies. In the 7 districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blaby introduced taxi licensing in 2001/02; their dual licensing system allows taxis to operate over a wider area, particularly useful for the more remote rural areas</li> <li>• Charnwood has high standards of compliance testing and has given particular attention to taxi stands in Loughborough town centre so as to make them fully complementary to buses</li> <li>• Harborough has similar standards and has recently improved the provision of taxi stands in the centre of Market Harborough with assistance from the County Council</li> </ul>	<p>The Public Transport Best Value Review outlined a programme of actions to expand the use of taxis involved in mainly rural taxi feeder services, often operating on a demand-responsive basis.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hinckley and Bosworth has, in partnership with ourselves, improved taxi provision in the centre of Hinckley</li> <li>• Melton has reviewed its licensing policy to take account of integrated transport and make it easier to introduce shared-taxi schemes</li> <li>• North West Leicestershire has reviewed evening taxi provision in Coalville and Ashby-de-la-Zouch, to be complementary to bus services and reduce crime and disorder problems</li> <li>• Oadby and Wigston have also reviewed, with us, the appropriate placing of taxi ranks.</li> </ul>	
<p>4. Public Transport Interchange</p> <p>a) Achievement of stretching local outcome indicators</p> <p>b) Delivery of substantial outputs (eg new interchange schemes) that are also at least equivalent to those included in the LTP1 strategy</p>	<p>a) Provide 8 improved interchanges</p> <p>b) Identify locations that could benefit from improved interchange facilities and service coordination and implement a prioritised programme of improvements.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>a) Achieved in 2005/06</p> <p>b) Examples of improved interchanges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hinckley - much improved as part of Regent Street scheme; new stops, shelters, raised kerbs, better footway access with bus priority in the area</li> <li>• Melton Mowbray – improved interchange at St Mary's Way, with new shelters, raised kerbs and road markings</li> <li>• Loughborough – rail station interchange described above</li> <li>• Improved local interchange at Billesdon between the main road hourly service and the Rural Rider service.</li> </ul>	
<p>5. Public Transport Information Improvements</p> <p>a) Evidence of an improved overall standard of bus information or a stronger council contribution to bus information.</p> <p>b) Evidence of strong</p>	<p>Increase the % of users satisfied with public transport information (BV103)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In partnership, assist in providing a comprehensive telephone enquiry service.</li> <li>• In partnership, assist in providing full public transport information on the internet.</li> <li>• In partnership, assist in providing roadside timetable displays at all main bus stops, and comprehensive printed timetables.</li> <li>• In partnership, promote particular contract services by leaflet</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p><b>BVPI 103</b></p> <p>This information is collected every 3 years. The last survey in 2003/04 showed an unexpected decline of user satisfaction from 69% in 2000/01 to 63%. Action to improve satisfaction has been taken through the implementation of the Bus Information Strategy. The recent 2006 Ipsos MORI survey indicated a satisfaction level of 67%.</p> <p><b>Bus Information Strategy</b></p> <p>A key achievement during LTP1, joint with City Council and the bus operators. Agreed specifications for all information with shared responsibility for provision, covering:</p>	<p>Public Transport Best Value Review supported the LTP1 strategy, formalised into a bus information strategy.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>and sustained partnerships and commitment to promote and improve public transport information.</p> <p>c) Delivery of local outcome indicators for public transport information.</p> <p>d) Strong or improved performance as monitored by BVPI 103.</p>	<p>timetables and other means.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In partnership, assist in providing the expanded star trak real time information system.</li> <li>• Develop and expand the capability of the PTI 2000 system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information displays at bus stops</li> <li>• The Traveline telephone and internet enquiry service</li> <li>• Timetable leaflets and booklets for commercial and contract services</li> <li>• Bus maps and guides</li> <li>• Real time bus information at bus stops, by text message or internet</li> <li>• Designated Travel Shops for personal enquiries</li> <li>• Service disruption notices.</li> <li>• On-vehicle information from drivers and displays.</li> </ul> <p>We have played a leading role in implementation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead in developing the regional database (started as PTI 2000) to be used by Traveline in the East Midlands, and establishing the new call centres, now working highly effectively</li> <li>• Heavy investment in star trak, with bus company partners and the city council. Details of the roll-out of star trak are given elsewhere in this report. The local authorities fund the software and on-street equipment, the bus companies pay for the on-vehicle equipment</li> <li>• Providing comprehensive public transport information on our own website</li> <li>• Door to door delivery of guides to the services in main urban areas at six monthly intervals</li> <li>• Reaching agreement to change timetables only on 6 standard dates each year</li> <li>• Providing public transport information for many of our tourism publications and initiatives.</li> </ul>	

Figure 4.2 – Implementation of Road Safety Strategy

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>Road Safety</p> <p>1. Progress on local casualty reduction targets up to 2005 and credible explanations for any targets not achieved.</p> <p>Stretching targets achieved.</p> <p>Strong performance on slight injury casualty levels.</p> <p>Performance on total casualties.</p>	<p>a) Output target to adopt a new casualty reduction strategy in 2001/02.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>(See Chapter 3 for further details of our progress towards targets)</p> <p>a) In July 2002 we adopted the new Road Safety Plan prepared under the auspices of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership (LLRRSP). This set out</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities for road safety actions for each year</li> <li>• A speed management strategy</li> <li>• Target setting and monitoring</li> <li>• Effective education, training and publicity measures</li> <li>• Partnership working.</li> </ul> <p>As a result of our investment and our improved monitoring procedures we have been successful in meeting all of our LTP1 targets. Our strategy reflects the high priority we give to improving road safety in the Leicestershire Community Strategy, our Medium Term Corporate Strategy and our Local Public Service Agreement (PSA) with the Government.</p>	<p>As part of our PSA action plan, in 2003 we carried out a comprehensive review of our casualty reduction programme. Its objective was to ensure that we continued to build on casualty reduction achievements, using the most cost-effective and efficient methods to reduce road casualties, and learning from best practice elsewhere. A number of recommendations from this review have fed into our road safety strategy, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wider use of accident data to inform the development and implementation of the wider transport programme, particularly road maintenance, to maximise casualty benefits from that programme</li> <li>• Improved use of the accident database to inform and develop a wider range of local safety schemes</li> <li>• Organisational changes to provide an increased focus on casualty reduction schemes to maintain and if possible increase the rate of return on road safety capital investment</li> <li>• Improved monitoring techniques to assess and learn from the effectiveness of schemes implemented in the programme.</li> </ul>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
	<p>b) Core indicators</p> <p>i. Reduce KSIs by 24% from 305 (1994-98 average) to 234 in 2005</p> <p>ii. Reduce child KSIs by 31% from 31% from 26 (1994-98 average) to 18 in 2005.</p>	<p>b) We have achieved both of our road safety core indicator targets in terms of number of KSI and child KSI within Leicestershire.</p> <p>i. KSIs reduced by 26% to 226 in 2005. This fall would have been much greater but for a significant rise in casualties on trunk roads and motorways in 2005. The equivalent figure for our own roads across the whole county was a 33% fall. We are working with the Highways Agency through the Road Safety Partnership to tackle this.</p> <p>ii. Child KSIs reduced by 50% to 13 in 2005 and the three year rolling average by 60% to 10.</p>	
	c) Reduce pedestrian and cyclist KSIs by 26% from 55 (1994-98 average) to 40 in 2005	c) This target had been achieved in earlier years but the figure of 45 casualties in 2005 was higher than the target. As with child KSIs the low number of casualties can lead to significant year on year fluctuations. The three year rolling average of 32 is a 42% reduction from the 1994-98 average which is well ahead of the target.	
	d) Reduce the number of slight casualties per 100k of population KSI (all road users combined) from 68.7 (1994-98 average) to 50.6 in 2005	d) We achieved our target, 2 years early in 2003 and continued meeting the target with a figure of 49.4 in 2005.	
	e) Reduce the number of casualties per 100k of population slight injury (all road users combined) from 467 (1994-98 average) to 465	e) We achieved our target, 2 years early in 2003 and continued meeting the target with a figure of 421 in 2005. This target has been stretched from the 2005 APR target of 506.	
	f) Reduce KSIs on County roads (excluding trunk roads and motorways) as part of local public service agreement by 28% from 326 (1994-98 average) to 235	f) We have achieved our PSA stretched target, with a 33% reduction to 220 in 2005.	PI introduced in 2003 as part of local PSA
	g) Reduce the number of casualties KSI on trunk roads (excluding motorways) as part of local public service agreement from 59 (1994-98	g) This was a very stretching target since trunk road KSIs had actually risen by over 50% to 70 in 2001/02. The target was reached in both 2003/04 and 2004/05 but, due to significant year on year fluctuations that occur with low numbers of casualties,	PI introduced in 2003 as part of local PSA

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
	average) to 42	increased to 56 in 2005/06. The three year rolling average of 46 is slightly above the target. We continue to work closely with the Highways Agency through the Road Safety Partnership to assist where we can. Two of the trunk roads (the A6 and A47) have recently been de-trunked and are now under our control.	
2. Contributions of partners to delivery and major outputs from partnerships (including health, planning and the police)	<p>In association with the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership (LLRRSP) a number of central objectives were identified:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify agreed targets</li> <li>• Develop a joint speed management strategy</li> <li>• Continue the development of an accident database</li> <li>• Demonstrate a commitment to TravelWise / mobility management / Business Travel Plans</li> <li>• Co-operate on practical scheme projects.</li> </ul> <p>The Partnership comprises the Leicestershire Police force, the three highway authorities, the fire and rescue service and the health authority.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Partnership working through the LLRRSP has assisted with achievement of our casualty reduction targets. Examples of LLRRSP and other partnering work include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LLRRSP delivered the safety camera scheme for the area. This success was when the Midlands Safety Camera Partnership was presented with a commendation certificate in November 2005 by the Prince Michael International Awards in recognition of our 'outstanding contribution to road safety'</li> <li>• Continued to develop our comprehensive accident database in line with Government and police requirements. This provides a detailed breakdown of accidents based on data provided by the police</li> <li>• Worked closely with emergency services to reduce road casualties including consulting them on traffic calming schemes against possible adverse effects on their response times</li> <li>• In partnership with Environ and Leicester City Council we have developed an adult cycle training programme called "re-cycle". The aim of the scheme is to help adults learn, relearn and practise their cycling road skills, gain confidence and real experience in dealing with traffic. The scheme continues to be developed in the County and has been adopted by Derby City Council who have used it for their own employees</li> <li>• We have worked with other agencies in the annual Junior Citizen and Safety squad events. This provides older primary school children with vital safety messages, including road safety, in real life situations</li> <li>• Participation in 'Shiny Side Up' partnership which comprises a number of authorities in the region. This aims to reduce motorcycle related accidents through a number of campaigns. This partnership received the Prince Michael International</li> </ul>	<p>In July 2002 we adopted the new Road Safety Plan, prepared under the auspices of the LLRRSP, which emphasised the importance of partnership working.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>road safety award</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attended quarterly meetings of the East Midlands Regional Accident Working Group, comprising all East Midlands highway authorities and the Highways Agency. We have exchanged experience, information and best practice with fellow members with a view to reducing road casualties</li> <li>• The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership has developed a strategy and Action Plan for each of the seven districts in Leicestershire and a number of the actions implemented have contributed to road safety initiatives</li> <li>• Using our highway advice to district councils on planning applications to ensure that new development does not prejudice road safety; similar input at the more strategic level to district local plans and local development frameworks.</li> </ul>	
3. Impact of the five year programme of local safety schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and treat specific locations with significantly reducible casualty records</li> <li>• Identify and treat locations suitable for route, area and mass action where there is potential for significant casualty reduction</li> <li>• Ensure changes to the highway are undertaken in ways that minimise casualty risk</li> <li>• Seek to achieve a highway network which minimises danger and encourages safe and confident use by all road users, particularly the more vulnerable road user.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy largely implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Table 1: Local Safety Schemes (which follows this pro-forma) summarises the impact of our LTP1 local safety scheme programme; in total 100 local safety schemes were implemented at a cost of £2.8 million.</p> <p>In line with our strategy these schemes comprised a wide range of measures including improved signs and road markings; mass action treatments (for example higher skid resistant surfaces); traffic calming schemes; junction improvements and route treatments. The 2006 Automobile Association "Euro RAP" report (European Road Assessment Programme) identified the A607 and A444 as two of the most improved routes in the country.</p> <p>Frequently, a scheme in one of our other overarching strategies has been able to make a positive contribution to road safety too. Therefore, whilst the road safety programme we implemented in LTP1 is responsible for a considerable amount of the success we have had in reducing casualties, other types of schemes such as those delivered through the LTP1 strategies for walking and cycling, network management, maintenance and travel management, have also helped to reduce the number of casualties.</p> <p>Safety audits were carried out at three stages for nearly all schemes implemented during LTP1: preliminary design stage, when detailed design is complete, and when construction is</p>	<p>Our PSA review highlighted above resulted in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A continuation of cluster site analysis and treatment</li> <li>• A greater focus on route analysis and treatment, prioritising investment on routes with high severity ratios and significant motorcycle casualties. Treatment tackles specific identified accident locations, provides an environment with consistent speed limits and road safety features that drivers recognise and respond to, and addresses feedback from motorcyclists on problems they face on the route</li> <li>• A wider-ranging analysis of the accident database to identify cost-effective mass action treatments, for instance high skid resistance surfacing, street lighting and bend warning signs</li> <li>• Urban area-wide investigation and treatment focussing on those areas with a concentration of accidents involving a high proportion of</li> </ul>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		complete. If necessary, remedial action was taken at each stage. This reduces the potential for adding accident dangers for road users when changes to the highway are made.	pedestrian and cycle casualties, particularly children. The improvements tackle both dispersed and clustered accidents in a comprehensive package of measures. We have also improved monitoring of the effectiveness of schemes to learn more from what works well and from schemes that have not performed so well.
4. Strong and systematic application of redesignation of roads, speed limits and supporting signing and road engineering	<p>Management of traffic through the Lorry Control Plan</p> <p>Development of a speed management strategy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the travelling public's attitudes to speed.</li> <li>• Enforcement of speed limit compliance.</li> <li>• Management of speed for safety, environmental and economic benefits by means of engineering.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>This has been achieved through measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lorry Control plan which, although it was primarily aimed at environmental improvements, has with its associated redesignation of roads also encouraged car drivers to use the most appropriate routes</li> <li>• The completion of our programme to introduce new speed limits (typically 30 mph but with some 40 and 50 mph) in rural settlements which are not already subject to 30 mph limits. This resulted in the introduction of new or revised speed limits in 59 villages</li> <li>• The safety camera scheme, which currently enforces speed limits at 53 sites within the county where there is a combination of road casualties and excessive speed. The latest figures for the enforcement sites show a 33% reduction in casualty accidents and a 71% reduction in KSIs in the period following introduction, compared with the three year period before, helped by our comprehensive programme of communications and public relations work</li> <li>• Traffic calming and village entry treatments in over 60 communities. Speeds have reduced typically by 25% with a saving of about 50 casualties per year</li> <li>• Experimental 20mph zones outside schools, leading to a policy of advisory limits coupled with amber flashing lights. These are now being introduced in appropriate circumstances, linked to school travel plans</li> <li>• One of the country's largest new Home Zones, planned with substantial advice from ourselves as a development of nearly 300 houses adjacent to the A5 in Hinckley</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of vehicle activated signs across the county, located where there are speed-related casualties. They are proving highly effective in reducing speeds and increasing driver awareness</li> <li>• New village entry treatments using timber signing, based on successful experience in another authority</li> <li>• Through our Htd guidance to developers, ensuring that safety is integral to highways constructed with new development.</li> </ul>	
5. Sustained use of substantial resources and delivery of outputs for road safety education, training and publicity (ETP) with key and significant impacts demonstrated	<p>Our local outcome indicators for LTP1 were:</p> <p>a) Increase % of schools provided with road safety services from 77% (in 2001/02) to 81%.</p> <p>b) Increase % year 6 (10/11 year old) pupils receiving cycle training from 52% (in 2001/02) to 60%.</p> <p>c) Support all relevant national campaigns.</p> <p>d) The LTP1 road safety education and training action plan was to continue a programme of learning to encourage a responsible attitude and an awareness of road safety issues. The Road Safety Plan set out a comprehensive programme of child education and training through schools and a range of measures to encourage safer driving.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>a) Target achieved 4 years early in 2002/03; actual figure of 83% in 2005/06. This is a stretching target since it is dependent on the willingness of schools and parents to participate.</p> <p>b) Achieved in 2005/06.</p> <p>c) Achieved throughout LTP1.</p> <p>d) Five full time officers deliver our programme of education, training and publicity. They have a revenue budget of nearly £200,000, with additional income from their activities of over £100,000 per year.</p> <p>Our extensive programmes of road safety and education and training for children include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of safe use of child restraints through practical help, advice and local publicity campaigns</li> <li>• Encouragement of safe walking through the 'Tiny Step' nursery and play group programme</li> <li>• Bike 4 Life cycle training to 60% of Leicestershire pupils</li> <li>• The establishment of a new safety centre with our community safety partners</li> <li>• Participation of over 170 primary schools in the Junior Road Safety Officers programme</li> <li>• Participation in annual Junior Road Safety Officers events.</li> </ul> <p>We now have one of the lowest rates of child pedestrian casualties in the country, with a rate per 100,000 population half the average of the 13 comparable authorities recommended by the Audit Commission to benchmark performance (for all the</p>	<p>In July 2002 we adopted the new Road Safety Plan which set out priorities for road safety actions including effective education, training and publicity measures. This has been further developed through the five years.</p> <p>During LTP1 consultants evaluated our road safety services to schools. One of the recommendations was to look at how the service is marketed, and as a result we developed and introduced an interactive website for schools. The website is primarily for secondary schools where teachers will be able to download lesson plans and ideas. It provides a more efficient way of targeting road safety services to the vulnerable age group of 12 – 13 year olds.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>above see LTP2 paragraph 6.67 for further details).</p> <p>To encourage safer driving we have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Run speed awareness courses in association with the safety camera scheme</li> <li>• Run a range of activities and awareness campaigns for motorcyclists</li> <li>• Run a 'Safer Driving with Age' (SAGE) scheme for about 150 older drivers a year</li> <li>• Run driver improvement courses for about 200 drivers a year who might otherwise be prosecuted for driving without due care</li> <li>• Distributed over 450 CD Roms on work-related road safety to local and national companies</li> <li>• Run an extensive programme of publicity campaigns (40 in 2005/06).</li> </ul> <p>(For all the above see LTP2 paragraphs 6.59, 6.69-6.77, 6.85-6.86 for further details).</p> <p>In partnership with Environ and Leicester City Council we have developed an adult cycle training programme called "re-cycle" to help adults learn, relearn and practice their cycling road skills.</p>	

Table 1: Local Safety Schemes

Financial Year	Number of Schemes Implemented	Total Costs £000s	Average Annual Number of Personal Injury Accidents (Three Years Before)	Average Annual Number of Personal Injury Accidents Saved
2001/02	14	332	77	12.34 (actual)
2002/03	26	675	196	31.01 (actual)
2003/04	10	583	138	22.70 (actual)
2004/05	30	629	141	7.9 (actual or forecast)
2005/06	20	607	163	19.7 (forecast)

Figure 4.3 – Implementation of Sustainability of Transport Policies

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>1. Airport surface access</p> <p>a) Achievement of local outcome indicators</p> <p>Challenging LTP1 targets achieved or substantial stretch achieved.</p> <p>b) Delivery of substantial improvements to surface access by the local authority with evidence of impacts.</p>	<p>a) Not applicable since no local outcome indicators were set in LTP1</p> <p>b) As part of the Airport's Air Transport Forum, the County Council worked with the Airport in producing a Surface Access Strategy in 2001.</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenging short and long term targets for increasing the proportion of journeys made to the airport by means other than the car</li> <li>A strategy including business travel plans for those who work at the airport to achieve those targets taking into account projected growth at the airport</li> <li>A system whereby the forum can oversee implementation of the strategy.</li> </ul> <p>c) Although outside the LTP, the East Midlands Parkway station was recognised as having the potential to provide a high frequency shuttle serviced to the airport.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>b) Surface Access Strategy targetted increase of 5% in proportion of employee journeys to and from the airport using a mode other than a single occupant in a car. Target has now been met</p> <p>We have assisted through taking a lead role with partners in developing much improved bus services to the airport, helped by Kickstart and emda funding. Service levels from Nottingham, Derby, Loughborough and Leicester are now such as to give near round-the-clock access by high quality and frequent buses. The impact is already being felt in the increase in employee journeys not involving a single car occupant, but we expect accelerated progress from 2006 onwards, with the full range of services in place and marketed with increasing effectiveness.</p> <p>We have also worked closely with Nottingham East Midlands Airport's (NEMA's) surface access manager to offer guidance from our own experience on other aspects of the surface access strategy.</p> <p>Many large companies are sited on the airport campus and we have worked with many of the largest – for example Powergen, DHL, Price Waterhouse Cooper – to help them develop travel plans.</p> <p>The airport transport forum has continued to meet regularly and receives periodic reports on progress with implementing the strategy. Summaries are also reported on to other bodies including the East Midlands Regional Association's transport group.</p>	<p>c) The East Midlands Parkway station, managed first by National Express Group and now by Network Rail, has been delayed due to several factors, particularly land acquisition</p>
<p>2. Co-ordination with Air Quality Action Plan and action on noise</p>	<p>Relevant local outcome indicator within LTP1 was 100% completion of the lorry control plan</p> <p>At the time of submission of LTP1 the district councils were carrying out</p>	<p><b>Air Quality -Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Local outcome target - the lorry route network is now 100% complete.</p> <p>Examples of work undertaken on air quality during LTP1 include:</p>	<p><b>AQMAs</b></p> <p>Subsequent to the LTP1 submission there has been ongoing joint working with the district councils, Leicester City Council and the Highways Agency. This</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>Achievement of local outcome target set in LTP1.</p> <p>Demonstration of significant reductions in contribution of road transport to pollution problems attributable to the local authority's action in air quality management areas or other hotspots.</p> <p>Suitable delivery of traffic management measures directly related to improving air quality.</p> <p>Delivery of substantial reductions in noise exposure due to local authority's actions.</p>	<p>detailed assessments of current and future air quality prior to declaration of AQMAs. The objective of LTP1 was to comply with the Air Quality Regulations 1997 and the National Strategy.</p> <p>Within LTP1 the noise objective was to minimise noise by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking traffic out of the most sensitive areas</li> <li>• Reducing traffic speeds</li> <li>• Using low noise surface materials and improving the maintenance of the road surface.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of the lorry control plan, which has contributed to improved air quality in communities where controls have been implemented</li> <li>• Reductions in concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> in parts of Loughborough, in Ashby and in Rearsby as a result of the Epinal Way extension and bypass schemes respectively. (In the case of Ashby this prevented its being declared an air quality management area)</li> <li>• Working with developers on transport assessments to ensure new development does not cause air quality problems in the area</li> <li>• Enhancement and regular reviews of our urban traffic management control systems, ensuring that vehicle delays are minimised with resulting air quality benefits.</li> <li>• Much of our LTP1 work in improving pedestrian, cycle and public transport facilities, and from our Smarter Choices initiatives, has contributed to improving air quality by helping to reduce traffic congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Noise - Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Examples of work undertaken during LTP1 to reduce noise nuisance include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of bypasses and relief roads as noted above, with consequent noise reductions for large numbers of households in the affected communities</li> <li>• Completion of the lorry route network, taking noisy HGVs out of a large number of Leicestershire villages</li> <li>• Completion of a large number of traffic calming schemes (Plan 4 in Chapter 2), reducing noise nuisance by slowing traffic</li> <li>• Research, with TRL, into noise characteristics of different road surfaces (see paragraphs 10.33 to 10.35 of LTP2), resulting in new practices locally.</li> </ul>	<p>has operated through the Air Quality Forum, which has ensured best practice and a common approach to air quality matters. We now have a much more evidence-based approach to improving air quality which we can use to ensure our efforts are concentrated at the most critical locations. As a result of this the initial 20 non-motorway declared AQMA's have been reduced to three (in Loughborough, Lutterworth and Kegworth). There are also three AQMAs near to the M1 motorway.</p>
<p>3. Action on Climate Change (including travel awareness)</p>	<p>Relevant local outcome indicators within LTP1 were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of national travel awareness campaigns supported locally</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p><b>Local outcome targets</b></p> <p>As demonstrated in chapter 3, all of these local outcome</p>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>Achievement of local outcome targets.</p> <p>Substantial sustained delivery of travel awareness campaigns.</p> <p>Quantification of impact of the overall strategy delivered on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions demonstrating an improvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public free long stay parking spaces for commuting by car into the 6 main town centres</li> <li>Number of schools with Travel Plans</li> <li>Number of major workplaces with adopted Travel Plans.</li> </ul>	<p>indicators have been achieved.</p> <p><b>Travel awareness campaigns</b> As detailed in Figure 4.1 and paragraphs 4.62 and 4.63 of LTP2, we have participated fully in travel awareness campaigns, including walk to school week, bike week, European mobility management day and walk to work out campaign, European car-free day and national festival of cycling.</p> <p><b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions</b></p> <p>No specific targets were set for CO<sub>2</sub> reductions but, APRs 1 and 2 indicated that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per vehicle mile were predicted to fall by about 2% per year. Table 2.4 of LTP2 indicate traffic growth of 7.9% in Leicestershire between 2000 and 2004 equating to approximately 1.6 % per year. With this amount of growth, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will have reduced by 2% during LTP1. The fall in emissions per vehicle mile is largely down to improved engine management, though our work to reduce congestion delays will have contributed at least at the margin to this. Many strands of our work, but particularly those to promote walking, cycling and public transport as alternatives to car use, will have contributed to controlling the growth in overall traffic in the county.</p>	
<p>4. Needs and Special Character of the Countryside</p> <p>Achievement of local outcome indicators related to rural areas.</p> <p>Achievement of the target for the accessibility core indicator or a credible explanation for its non achievement.</p>	<p>Relevant local outcome indicator within LTP1 was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of all households within 800m walk of an hourly or better bus service.</li> </ul> <p>The strategy within LTP1 for rural accessibility was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain access standards in the more rural areas with attention to specific needs which are to be provided for</li> <li>Use of as wide as possible a range of transport solutions and as much community involvement as possible in order to maximise cost-</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p><b>Local outcome indicator and core indicator achievement</b> – Chapter 3 demonstrates how our target of 95% coverage of hourly bus services was achieved in 2004, with a corresponding increase in rural households served by the hourly bus network</p> <p><b>Delivery of substantial rural transport outputs</b></p> <p>Chapter 2 demonstrates how we have carried out substantial improvements to rural transport accessibility, with our partners. Main strands of this work have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completion of our hourly bus services network, forming the essential core framework of services throughout rural Leicestershire</li> <li>Countywide coverage of transport services for people with mobility impairments</li> </ul>	<p>Our Public Transport Best Value Review, gave priority to developing the integrated network of bus services to tackle accessibility problems in rural areas. This was coupled with the new approach for the smaller rural communities lying off this network in which, working with community groups, priorities for access are defined and met, often using innovative services.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>Achievement of stretching levels of improvements to rural accessibility.</p> <p>Delivery of substantial rural transport outputs (eg enhanced rural passenger transport services, large quiet lane projects)</p>	<p>effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further development of community based transport with the intention of providing cost effective solutions for other small scale access needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Much-extended community transport in rural areas, with 37 villages served by demand-responsive services and many others by conventional buses, with much increased community involvement in service design</li> <li>Service innovation including taxi-buses and our Rural Rider scheme</li> <li>Our transport to health project, helping rural people access clinics and surgeries</li> <li>Special evening services to give access for young people</li> <li>Improved travel concessions – half fare passes and vouchers, on nearly all rural transport services</li> <li>Infrastructure improvements, including contributions to 80+ rural bus shelters</li> <li>Generous provision of school transport, beyond statutory requirements, to help rural children access school.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other improvements to rural accessibility</b></p> <p>We have improved cycle and walking access in rural Leicestershire through a large number of, generally small-scale, local improvements, and there have also been larger scale projects such as access developments we have carried out in partnership within the National Forest. LTP1 did not cover our rights of way network, but it may be noted that the signing and ease of use of the rural network was substantially improved during LTP1.</p>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>5. Sustainable Distribution</p> <p>Achievement of local outcome indicators related to sustainable distribution or credible explanations for their non achievement</p> <p>Establishment of freight quality partnerships, delivering significant outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>Effective implementation of substantial lorry routing strategies or strategies to transfer flows to other modes.</p>	<p>Relevant local outcome indicator within LTP1 was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% completion of the lorry control plan.</li> </ul> <p>The strategy within LTP1 for sustainable distribution was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concentrate traffic movements and growth on the safest and most suitable roads</li> <li>• Implement measures to encourage sustainable distribution and to minimise the impact of lorries</li> <li>• Ensure more efficient and sustainable freight on suitable routes through implementation of our lorry control plan.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p><b>Lorry Control Plan local outcome indicator achievement</b> – we completed the lorry route network during LTP1, moving from 60% to 100% coverage.</p> <p><b>Achievement of LTP1 strategy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lorry route network has been effective in concentrating HGVs onto the safest and most suitable roads. Compliance is good, and we have recently taken further steps to ensure effective enforcement</li> <li>• We established a Freight Quality Partnership in March 2000, with membership including the Freight Transport Association, the Road Haulage Association, Transport 2000, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, representatives from air, rail and waterways, and various freight operators</li> <li>• Working groups from the Partnership have studied the possibilities of increased use of rail and water for freight, and encouraged operators to apply for rail freight grants</li> <li>• In consultation with the Partnership, we have improved signing, maintenance and safety on the lorry route network, thereby helping the road haulage industry. Our strategy was highlighted in the Rural White Paper as best practice</li> <li>• We have involved the Partnership in the development of many of our transport schemes, including town centre improvements in Hinckley and Loughborough</li> </ul> <p>We have supported the provision of additional rail freight terminals, for example helping in the planning of the Castle Donington distribution centre.</p>	

Figure 4.4 – Principal road maintenance / bridge strengthening

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p><b>Principal road maintenance</b></p> <p>A demonstrable improvement to the condition of the highway network over the LTP1 period</p> <p>A target for improved road condition achieved (or on track where and when survey methods amended)</p>	<p>Maintain the County Council's highway network to a standard that provides for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods, and does not inhibit walking and cycling.</p> <p>Priority to be given to the Primary Route Network and other roads of strategic importance such as the lorry control routes.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Chapter 3 demonstrates in detail how we have improved the condition of all our categories of carriageway and footway, fully meeting our targets and bringing us from a relatively poor position in the national context to a very strong position. We have achieved this through effective condition measurement and maintenance planning, through value-for-money works procurement, and through committing substantial resources, including all the allocated LTP capital, all government revenue allocation, and further resources of our own.</p>	<p>In 2002 we carried out a strategy review to ensure that our spending was properly directed towards improving the network. We have developed that work further over the last 18 months in the development of our first transport asset management plan.</p>
<p>Evidence of significant outcomes for integrated transport, the environment and the economy delivered by maintenance schemes</p>	<p>a) Facilitate the efficient and sustainable movement of road freight on most suitable routes and concentrate traffic movements and growth on the safest and most suitable roads.</p> <p>b) Continue to remove barriers to free movement by disabled people.</p> <p>c) Consult businesses and the local community prior to implementing measures that are likely to cause an interruption or significant decline in the service. Minimise interruptions and delays while carrying out maintenance work.</p> <p>d) Where possible give consideration to coordinating improvements and major maintenance works.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>a) We have completed our county-wide lorry routing network and introduced weight restrictions on most other rural roads. We have spent substantially to ensure that the lorry route network is of adequate standard, and are beginning to gain the benefit from reduced maintenance requirement on roads not forming part of that network.</p> <p>b) We have many examples of small-scale improvements to footways designed to ease movement, for example dropped kerbs, and have increased to 98% the proportion of signalised crossings equipped fully for use by disabled people (for detail see the equality analysis in Chapter 2).</p> <p>c) We have well-established procedures for dealing with the effects of roadworks and other disruptions, and have developed these further in preparation for the introduction of our network management duty. Measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular roadworks co-ordination meetings with statutory undertakers and neighbouring authorities, designed to</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>minimise disruption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed works planning to minimise delays and disruption</li> <li>• Other cross-boundary co-ordination, for example for winter maintenance</li> <li>• Regular liaison with the police, for planned road closures and other issues</li> <li>• Full consultation with bus operators for road closures</li> <li>• Consultation with local communities and businesses prior to any extensive road works, using our roadworks protocol which also ensures effective communication through various media of the dates of closures and diversion routes</li> <li>• Customer feedback surveys carried out for a sample of our schemes, to learn lessons for future changes to procedures</li> <li>• A full traffic information service provided by Area Traffic Control, via BBC Radio Leicester and other outlets.</li> </ul> <p>d) Our Works Programme Management Group, amongst other things, assesses the scope for combining maintenance and improvement works, to minimise overall disruption when two schemes are to be carried out in the same area. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bend alignment improvement as part of maintenance works on the A607</li> <li>• Advanced cycle stop lines and other facilities introduced when resurfacing traffic signal junctions</li> <li>• Introduction of 4.4 km of new cycle lane when the A47 at Leicester Forest East was resurfaced</li> <li>• Application of anti-skid surfacing in appropriate locations when resurfacing is taking place..</li> </ul>	
Evidence that environmental considerations are integrated into scheme design and implementation	<p>Recognise the highway as being of environmental importance as part of the wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Regard the safeguarding of watercourses and the protection of wildlife species as areas of particular concern.</p> <p>In carrying out works, reduce waste and re-use or recycle existing materials as much as possible.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p><b>Safeguarding watercourses and wildlife</b></p> <p>As examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When designing Rearsby Bypass we constructed four tunnels for badgers and provided ledges on structures to allow other wildlife to cross the road safely. We also constructed fencing on the road boundary to prevent yellow crested newts from straying on to the carriageway. The balancing pond was constructed in such a way as to allow</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>aquatic life to flourish. Additional planting was provided on the banks of the bypass to protect the watercourses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of the Epinal Way extension scheme we provided a tunnel to allow badgers to cross the road safely and erected fencing specifically to prevent badgers from burrowing and finding their way onto the carriageway</li> <li>• Our policy for maintaining rural highway verges was developed in conjunction with the County Ecologist to take account of the needs of the environment and wildlife habitat</li> <li>• When undertaking construction works we take measures to control run-offs from works, for example not washing concrete into drains or grass. We also carry out works to maintain highway drainage and so minimise run-offs, with benefit to watercourses</li> <li>• We take regular action to control the spread of noxious weeds and so protect wildlife habitats. In doing so we use products chosen so as not to harm wildlife.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recycling initiatives</b></p> <p>During LTP1 we have developed several recycling initiatives and gained a national reputation for innovation (see Figure 2.11 in Chapter 2). Our recycling initiatives have also been viewed by a number of other counties and received very positive feedback. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25,000 tonnes per year of footway and carriageway non-contaminated materials (kerbs, concrete, stone) arising from highways maintenance and improvement schemes were screened, crushed and available for re-use in the County's highway maintenance and improvement works</li> <li>• 3,000 tonnes of topsoil per year was collected, transported, screened and stored available for re-use</li> <li>• Mobile unit used to re-heat excavated bituminous material and re-use at the same location, thereby saving substantial transport costs as well as producing 100% recycling. Currently used on footways and published by TRL as best practice</li> <li>• Sweeping up surplus surface dressing chippings then washing and screening by size for re-use. Our practice now followed by other Midlands authorities</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased use of sustainable urban drainage, for example on the Rearsby Bypass, where one substantial balancing pond was developed as a wildlife area</li> <li>• Recycling 2.7 million litres of waste water a year from our 115,000 gullies through our Billesdon 'Living Water' treatment plant. Dry residue from the arisings is used as verge fill. Commissioned in 2002, this has attracted widespread interest. It also includes an amenity area of wetlands, pond and meadow</li> <li>• Waste recycling – each year including 200 tonnes of scrap metal, 23,000 street lighting bulbs and 1,000 tonnes of wood chip produced from forestry operations for re-use as mulch.</li> </ul>	
Evidence that the programme has provided good value for money and has been delivered cost effectively.	Maintain asset value of the network of highways and bridges at minimum cost in terms of both structural and operational performance.	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient works delivery has helped us reduce the days/km of traffic controls or closure for traffic-sensitive roads to 0.3 by 2005/06 (BV100)</li> <li>• Preventative maintenance – As noted earlier in the report, we use carriageway surface dressing and footway slurry sealing to extend substantially the life of these assets. The process is highly cost-effective, costing around 5% as much as resurfacing</li> <li>• Our new Highway Patrols – single vehicles operating with small gangs – help us respond quickly and cost-effectively to defects and emergencies</li> <li>• To ensure consistency and continuous improvement in service delivery, two Standards Officers have been appointed to monitor not only safety and quality but also customer satisfaction with the service</li> <li>• We have moved front line services from County Hall to local offices, to help provide integrated local service delivery</li> <li>• Our highways management IT system delivers improved resource allocation and management, supporting the management of our highway network by improving inspection processes and work planning. Other authorities in the Midlands are now learning from our experience with this</li> <li>• We have reviewed our highways, street lighting and structures codes of practice in the light of new national guidance, to ensure that we are working to standards which</li> </ul>	Our 2002 Highways Network Management Best Value Review resulted in 65 recommendations for improved performance, not altering fundamentally our previous practice but seeking a wide range of improvements at the detailed level. A number of these changes are reflected in the examples given alongside.

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>support proper asset management at least cost</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective cross-boundary working with neighbouring authorities ensures that we take advantage of cost savings from integrated work across the boundary</li> <li>• Quality assurance – the design, construction and maintenance work of our department is accredited to quality standard BS EN ISO 9001:2000. This helps to ensure consistent quality</li> <li>• Works procurement – our in-house delivery unit has proved itself cost-effective against private sector competition throughout the period of compulsory competitive tendering. We have moved the unit into a 'best value' framework now, removing the internal barriers which increased cost, whilst at the same time maintaining a programme of cost competition to ensure it remains fully competitive</li> <li>• Winter maintenance benefits from state of the art forecasting to minimise wasted call-outs along with an annual review of routes designed to minimise spreading cost. Our high standards in salting roads have been widely commended in the county.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Bridge strengthening</b></p> <p>Evidence of significant reductions in structures related weight and width restrictions on the PRN network and the principal road network as a whole.</p> <p>Stretching targets or stretching progress achieved related to bridge strengthening and maintenance.</p>	<p>Local Target</p> <p>Priority given to the Primary Route Network and other roads of strategic importance such as the lorry control routes.</p> <p>Reduce the % of bridges on County roads below intended carrying capacity from 4.7% (1999/2000 baseline) to 0.9%.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Both pre and post LTP1, there are no structures with weight and width restrictions on our principal road network.</p> <p>We achieved our local target in 2005/06, with 0.6% of bridges on county roads below intended carrying capacity.</p> <p>Features of our work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment using standardised Bridge Condition Indicators</li> <li>• By end of LTP1 met standards proposed by County Surveyors' Society for the number of bridges below thresholds</li> <li>• Have incorporated maintenance work at marginal cost into our strengthening programme</li> </ul> <p>Have programmes of preventative maintenance, for example painting steel parapets on an average 15 year frequency.</p>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
Evidence that environmental considerations are integrated into scheme design and implementation	Recognise the importance of bridges in terms of their architectural and historic interests.	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Wildlife examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adhere strictly to Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 when considering protected species that may inhabit or be affected by bridge strengthening/maintenance works</li> <li>• Use ecologists to determine impact on wildlife and recommend any necessary steps to be taken</li> <li>• During LTP1 we trained a staff member to carry out wildlife surveys required for the maintenance of structures</li> <li>• A few bridges have required bat exclusion and subsequent erection of bat boxes to offset the lost habitat</li> <li>• White clawed crayfish have had to be trapped and removed</li> <li>• Maintenance timed to match the lifecycle of bats in particular.</li> </ul> <p>Historic interest and architecture examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Easton bridge was sympathetically redecked in reinforced concrete to blend in with its surroundings, and brick parapets were used to replace an inappropriate steel fence</li> <li>• 14 listed structures received maintenance, from packhorse bridges to bridges on the principal road network. Consultation and approval from English Heritage, sensitive design and use of appropriate materials including 'aged' hand-made bricks</li> <li>• One listed structure damaged as a result of an accident required a recast period handrail.</li> </ul>	
Evidence that the programme has delivered significant outcomes for integrated transport, the environment and the economy	Strengthen and maintain the bridge stock to ensure the highway network continues to fulfil the requirements of industry, agriculture, bus and emergency services and the local community.	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Examples of schemes implemented in LTP1 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A badly corroded twin span steel railway bridge at Quorn required historically sympathetic replacement. Reconstruction permitted a temporary weight limit to be removed from a road on the lorry route network, so aiding the movement of HGVs, and allowed unimpeded use of the steam railway, which is an important economic tourist attraction for Leicestershire</li> <li>• We identified 13 canal bridges as being substandard. Seven have been weight limited, but six have been strengthened as a result of concerns in the farming</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>community. Had they not been strengthened, movement of large farming vehicles would have been restricted with a consequential loss to the economy of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A replacement bridge at Station Road, Croft was co-ordinated with replacement of a Severn Trent water main to avoid further disruption. An otter run was provided and landscaping carried out to an adjacent picnic site to the benefit of the local community</li> <li>• A new foot/cycleway bridge at Coalville was linked into a wider landscaping and planting scheme to help regeneration in the vicinity, with highly successful results.</li> </ul>	
<p>Evidence that the schemes implemented reflect wider transport priorities, have been influenced by stakeholder consultation that there is a strong cooperative working with private bridge owners</p>	<p>Consult with relevant bodies where appropriate such as English Heritage, English Nature and the Environment Agency as a preliminary stage to all planned works.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>Many of the examples quoted above contain evidence for this but, in addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We work extensively with Network Rail, contributing financially to strengthening for 40 tonne capacity, installing rail incursion barriers and providing traffic management as well as co-operating on the timing of works</li> <li>• We work similarly with British Waterways, have paid for the strengthening of a number of canal bridges from our own funds and have, on the basis of commuted sums, taken further bridges into our ownership</li> <li>• We always consult local businesses when major works to bridges are required. Most concerns are around alternative routes for delivery vehicles</li> <li>• We similarly consult bus operators, for whom diversionary routes are often difficult to arrange. In one extreme case the operator had to run buses up to either side of the closure, with financial support</li> <li>• Network Rail has recently strengthened the Meadow Lane railway bridge, Loughborough, in a joint initiative with ourselves and the adjoining Brush factory. As a result it has been possible to strengthen the bridge in such a way that it can form part of an abnormal loads route from the Brush site through Loughborough to the M1 Motorway.</li> </ul>	

Figure 4.5 – Disability issues / social inclusion

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
<p>Evidence that the mobility of disabled people has been improved substantially by the delivery of transport related improvements involving the local authority.</p>	<p>Continue to remove the barriers to the free movement of disabled people through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of whole route improvements to eliminate barriers to mobility</li> <li>• Development of accessible transport services</li> <li>• Provision of information</li> <li>• Staff training and awareness.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned.</b></p> <p>Much of the detail on public transport improvements is given in Figure 4.1 and summarised below, along with detail of other initiatives.</p> <p><b>Improvements for pedestrians, for example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many local footway improvements, including appropriate use of dropped kerbs and tactile paving</li> <li>• Close consultation with local disability groups to achieve this</li> <li>• Ensuring 98% of signal controlled crossings are fully compliant for use by disabled people</li> <li>• Provision of full disabled facilities, in consultation with local groups, in our town centre schemes such as that in Hinckley.</li> </ul> <p><b>Improvements for public transport users, for example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full countywide coverage of special transport services for disabled people, with doubled support for this transport</li> <li>• New and innovatory services, including dial-a-ride and shared taxis, particularly suitable for use by those with mobility impairments</li> <li>• Choice of concessionary travel tokens or half fare passes, available for use by disabled people on all our special services and not just buses, thereby making access much more affordable. 11,000 people hold concessions</li> <li>• Extended coverage for our concessionary travel scheme – across the county boundary and into Leicester – giving improved access opportunities</li> <li>• Full programme to install raised kerbs at bus stops, with 225 installed to date, making access to buses much easier</li> <li>• 50% of the county bus fleet now low-floor, easing access and providing particularly for wheelchair users. Although most of the investment has been by the bus companies they have often done so in association with Quality Bus Partnership initiatives or to operate County Council contract services</li> <li>• A bus information strategy, joint with the bus companies and Leicester City, which emphasises the provision of clear and simple information through a range of outlets, particularly</li> </ul>	<p>Our Public Transport Best Value Review placed an even higher emphasis on proper planning to improve access for people with mobility impairments, and this is reflected in a number of the initiatives detailed alongside.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>making the public transport system more understandable. Braille, tape and large print versions produced on demand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our transport to health project, joint with the ambulance service and health authorities, designed to provide integrated transport to clinics and surgeries, so making health access easier for those with mobility impairments.</li> </ul> <p><b>General improvements, for example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three year programme of disability awareness for staff</li> <li>• Disability awareness included in customer care courses we have run for bus drivers</li> <li>• Provision of large print and Braille versions of scheme consultation leaflets, and provision of sign language interpreters at public meetings concerning schemes</li> <li>• Full review of on-street parking for disabled people during LTP1, with consequent improvements in most county towns</li> <li>• Extensive programme to provide advisory disabled parking spaces outside people's homes.</li> </ul>	
Achievements of stretching targets for or stretching progress on improving access for disabled people (including substantial provision at pedestrian crossings, accessible bus services and related infrastructure).	<p>a) Increase the % of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people (BV165) from 75% to 95% between 1999/00 and 2004/05</p> <p>b) Remove barriers to movement by disabled people by increasing the % of bus fleet with low floors for level access and faster boarding from 24% to 45% during LTP1</p> <p>c) Remove barriers to movement by disabled people by increasing the journeys per week using complementary public transport services for disabled people from 1494 in 2002/03 to 1700 in 2005/06.</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>a) We achieved our target in 2004/05 and reached 98% in 2005/06</p> <p>b) We achieved our target in 2004/05 and reached 50% in 2005/06</p> <p>c) We achieved in 2004/05 and increased usage to 1737 in 2005/06. (An initial target of 1,550 was set in APR3 and stretched to 1,700 in APR4 which we have now exceeded)</p>	
Delivery of significant elements in projects to ensure they are accessible to disabled people.	<p>Consultation with disabled groups to identify barriers to mobility of disabled people within the existing road network.</p> <p>Development and implementation of</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>A number of relevant examples have been given above. Others include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive liaison between our Area Engineers and local disability groups, resulting in a series of small-scale</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
	<p>whole route improvements to eliminate barriers to mobility.</p> <p>Safety audit of new works design which includes analysis of the design from the perspective of mobility impaired people.</p> <p>Parking initiatives for disabled people.</p> <p>Improvements to existing signal controlled pedestrian crossings.</p>	<p>improvements such as dropped kerbs, tactile paving and extended footways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey audits with disability groups, for example the Handstand group in North West Leicestershire, resulting in improvements to key access routes, for example to shops or day centres</li> <li>• Consultation with individual disabled people, and disability groups, on the siting of new bus stops, including those with raised kerbs, for example on the Loughborough to Leicester Quality Bus Corridor project</li> <li>• Analysis of bus stop provision to ensure proximity to important facilities, for example sheltered accommodation</li> <li>• Our guide to developers, "Highways, transportation and development", aims to make development more accessible and sustainable, including guidance on bus stop infrastructure such as level access kerbs and new bus shelters</li> <li>• Our Hinckley town centre improvement scheme created new bus stops with raised kerbs in convenient locations, full disabled facilities at informal and formal crossing points, and 12 new parking spaces for disabled people</li> <li>• We carried out approximately 250 road safety audits of road improvement schemes during LTP1. Consideration of the perspective of elderly and disabled people is included specifically in the audit guidance</li> <li>• As noted above, we have improved on-street parking provision for disabled people in all our main towns during LTP1 and also carried out a programme of advisory markings to allow disabled people to park without hindrance outside their homes.</li> </ul>	
<p>Evidence of strong partnership working with transport operators to reflect the needs of disabled people.</p>	<p>Consult with disabled groups and other agencies including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality Bus Partnerships</li> <li>• Rural Transport Partnerships</li> <li>• Community transport providers</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned</b></p> <p>As detailed above, partnership with transport operators and others involved in transport has helped us to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 95% coverage of hourly services, bringing transport much closer for many disabled people</li> <li>• 50% of fleet now low-floor buses, in partnership with our provision of over 225 raised kerbs</li> <li>• Countywide coverage of special transport services for people with mobility impairments</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disability awareness training for many bus drivers</li> <li>• Our transport to health initiative, providing improved transport to clinics and surgeries</li> <li>• Improved information on transport services available for those with disabilities</li> </ul> <p>Consultation with disability groups has helped us to achieve many of the public transport improvements, with a particular input to the policies derived in our Public Transport Best Value Review. It has also helped us improve access for pedestrians through route audits, improved crossings and footways, parking provision and other measures as noted above.</p>	
<p>Substantial evidence that the plan's implementation has improved transport provision for social groups including women, older people, younger people, people from ethnic backgrounds and those on low incomes.</p>		<p><b>Significant provision made, though this did not form a separately identified part of the LTP1 strategy.</b></p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our community safety lighting, and advice in "Highways, transportation and development" on designing out crime, both tackle the barriers to access for many in these groups created by fear of crime</li> <li>• Our provision of improved street lighting standards in town and village centres, and careful location of bus stops together with the increasing provision of CCTV on buses, also contribute to reducing this fear</li> <li>• We are active members of the district-based crime reduction partnerships, which help us to focus on these and other improvements, including CCTV in town centres</li> <li>• Our traffic calming and other speed reduction schemes have helped to reduce the perceived threat to pedestrians from traffic. This is particularly helpful for elderly and disabled people, and parents with children</li> <li>• Through our school travel plan work, and linked investment in cycling and walking routes, we try particularly to help access for young people.</li> <li>• We have invested substantially in further formal and informal crossing points in villages and towns, using maximum flexibility against "PV<sup>2</sup>" criteria where this is justified. These crossings help particularly young people and</li> </ul>	<p>The strategy within the LTP1 was one of inclusiveness for all groups of people and there are no specific policies relating to women, older people, younger people and people from ethnic backgrounds. A number of our measures, particularly concessionary travel, were aimed particularly at those on low incomes.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<p>elderly people, as well as those with mobility impairments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of our responsive work at the local level is done to meet the needs of people in these groups. For example, we resurfaced a stone-surfaced footpath in Ibstock at the request of elderly residents, to make it easier to walk on</li> <li>• Many people from ethnic minorities live in the urban centres of Loughborough and Wigston. Our programmes to make walking more safe and more secure are particularly relevant in these areas, which have dense housing close by relatively busily trafficked streets. Our programmes for school travel plans and safe routes to school can also be particularly effective in these areas.</li> <li>• We have long-established procedures for translating all our consultation materials and other information into ethnic minority, particularly Asian, languages. The County Council has procedures in place to allow a swift response to requests for translation, as well as for Braille or large print versions of information.</li> <li>• Our investment in improved bus services, described above and including a wide range of measures to improve both conventional and community-based services, has benefits for many young people, elderly people and those on low incomes</li> <li>• We help with the cost of travel by providing concessions to 67,000 elderly and 11,000 disabled people</li> <li>• Our generous provision of home to school transport, well above the statutory requirements, is of benefit to many young people, and particularly to families on low incomes</li> <li>• Through the Young Persons Citizens' Jury and Youth Council we have designed and introduced bus services to meet specific needs of young people, for example transport from rurally isolated villages to a youth club in Hinckley.</li> </ul>	
An accessibility strategy consistent with S2.6 of the accessibility guidance in place by the end of 2004	We had no explicit accessibility strategy during LTP1, but many of our measures, and particularly the provision of the hourly bus services network following the Public Transport Best Value Review, laid the main foundations for the strategy we have since developed	<p><b>Substantial progress made</b></p> <p>During LTP1 we made substantial progress in developing our accessibility strategy through the development of our framework Accessibility Strategy which included :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of an accessibility forum involving PCTs, NHS Trusts, Job Centre Plus, Post 16 Education Transport Partnership, district councils, Leicester City Council</li> <li>• Accessibility mapping</li> </ul>	

Delivery Benchmark	What we said we'd do	What has been done? (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanation for changes to what was planned
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of priorities for action</li> <li>• Development of draft action plans</li> <li>• Development of key outcome targets and intermediate outcome targets.</li> </ul> <p>Our two part accessibility strategy was submitted to government as part of our final LTP in March 2006.</p> <p>The first part focuses particularly on the access needs of people on low incomes whilst the second part is a development of work we have been undertaking over a long period to bring about general improvements to access by public transport, walking and cycling.</p>	

