
APPENDIX B

Report of consultations

B.1 This appendix summarises the 2 stages of the consultation for the LTP, held in autumn 2004 and winter 2005. The Stage 1 consultation sought opinions principally on the draft strategies to be included in the Provisional LTP Stage 2, based on the published Provisional LTP and its associated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), focused mainly on the LTP programmes and the proposed changes arising from the SEA.

B.2 Also appended are the preliminary results of a customer satisfaction survey carried out in February 2006.

Stage 1 LTP consultation

B.3 The LTP draft strategy was based on consultation and engagement throughout the period of the first LTP but we undertook specific consultation over a 12 week period from 22 October 2004 to 14 January 2005. The aim of this was to ensure that all users of the transport system had the opportunity to contribute to developing the proposals for the second LTP.

B.4 The draft strategy was based on delivering the following 5 objectives:

- To tackle congestion
- To improve access to facilities
- To reduce road accident casualties
- To improve air quality and reduce the impact of traffic
- To maintain our roads and pavements in good condition.

The consultation process

B.5 Our overall approach was to build on the successes from the first LTP by maximising the use of established consultation mechanisms and using the local media to inform as many people as possible.

B.6 Consultation consisted of:

- A general press release about the consultation and where further information was available
- A total of 20 presentations to stakeholders, including District Highway Forums and Local Strategic Partnerships
- Production of a leaflet setting out the objectives, and proposals for achieving them. The leaflet included a questionnaire
- Inclusion of the leaflet and online questionnaire on the Leicestershire County Council website
- A full-page article in the November 2004 Leicestershire Matters, which was distributed to all households in the county. This included details of how and where to get a copy of the leaflet, and encouraged people to use the feedback form to let us know their views

- Sending the leaflet directly to 385 stakeholders, including 96 to members of Local Strategic Partnerships, and 227 Leicestershire parish councils. Copies were also made available in all County Council libraries and Service Shops
- Inclusion of the same consultation questions in the autumn 2004 ‘Leicestershire’s Voice’ Citizens’ Panel.

Summary of consultation responses

B.7 The responses to consultation have been broken down into:

- Questionnaire responses
- ‘Leicestershire’s Voice’ Citizens’ Panel responses
- Letters
- District Council responses
- Highway Forum comments.

B.8 The remainder of this report summarises the responses and draws conclusions.

Questionnaire responses

B.9 In total we received 401 completed questionnaires, 191 through the post and 210 on-line. 66 letters and e-mails were also received. The questionnaire consisted of 3 questions to gauge support for the objectives and how they could be achieved, and one to give people the opportunity to let us know their overall opinions.

Q1: What priority do you think should be given to each objective?

	High		Medium		Low		Not a priority		No response	
		%		%		%		%		%
Congestion	296	74	74	18	10	2.5	9	2.5	12	3
Accessibility	132	33	163	41	64	16	12	3	30	7
Air quality / traffic impact	238	59.5	98	24.5	25	6	11	3	29	7
Casualty reduction	204	51.5	125	31	37	9	10	2.5	25	6
Maintenance	161	40	174	43	22	5.5	3	1.5	41	10

B.10 These responses have been analysed by assessing a mean priority for each objective. Before generating the mean the results were weighted as ‘High’ =3, ‘Medium’ =2, ‘Low’ =1, ‘Not a priority’ =0. This analysis gives the following results:

Congestion:	2.69	Maintenance:	2.37
Air quality / traffic impact:	2.51	Accessibility:	2.12
Casualty reduction:	2.39		

B.11 With the mean scores lying between 2 (‘Medium’) and 3 (‘High’), the analysis shows overall support for all the elements of the draft strategy.

Q2: How far do you agree or disagree that our proposals are the best way to achieve each objective?

	Strongly agree		Agree		No opinion		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No response	
		%		%		%		%		%		%
Congestion	76	19	152	40	60	15	38	8.5	29	6.5	46	11
Accessibility	41	9.5	131	33	143	35.5	28	7	7	2	51	13
Air quality / traffic impact	63	16	149	37	87	22	29	7	22	5	51	13
Casualty red.	51	13	135	34	99	25	39	9.5	22	4.5	55	14
Maintenance	68	17	159	40	96	24	16	4	10	2	52	13

B.12 There is general agreement that the proposals will meet the objectives. The greatest support is for the proposals to reduce congestion (59%), maintain roads and pavements in good condition (57%) and improve air quality / reduce the impact of traffic (53%).

B.13 The percentage of respondents who disagreed with the proposals was considerably lower than those who agreed. Congestion (15%), casualty reduction (14%) and air quality/reducing the impact of traffic (12%) had the highest scores.

B.14 A significant proportion of respondents had either no opinion or did not provide a response. This is most notable with accessibility, where 49% had no opinion or gave no response. This may be due to a lack of understanding of the issues, or because the proposals were at that stage not sufficiently developed to give a good overall picture.

Q3: What priority do you think should be given to our larger schemes?

	High		Medium		Low		Not a priority		No response	
		%		%		%		%		%
Loughborough Inner Relief Road	75	19	141	35	65	16	39	10	81	20
Melton measures	169	42	102	25	47	12	24	6	59	15
Kibworth Bypass	46	11	115	29	101	25	47	12	92	23
M1 Junction 21 area	122	30.5	117	29	56	14	24	6	82	20.5
Lorry route bypasses	148	37	107	27	52	13	27	6	67	17
Cycle network	134	33.5	97	24	64	16	48	12	58	14.5
Bus corridors	140	35	100	25	55	14	48	12	58	14

B.15 Although these schemes are local in nature, at least 40% of respondents considered each of them to be of medium or high priority and only about 10% considered them to be not a priority at all.

B.16 Almost 95% of respondents to the questionnaire included their postcodes. This has enabled us to look in more detail at where there is support for certain schemes. Of the 401 total responses, 103 were from people who live within the built up area of Melton Mowbray. Of these, 100 replied that Melton measures have a high priority. The disproportionately high level of responses to the consultation may be because of additional publicity for the LTP consultation generated in the town by both the Borough Council and the Melton Times.

B.17 There was a total of 54 responses from people who live within the built up area of Loughborough. Of these, 22 gave the inner relief road a high priority, 16 a medium priority and 5 a low priority.

Q4: Do you have any other comments on the proposals in this leaflet for the next Local Transport Plan?

B.18 This was an open question to give people the opportunity to make any comments they wanted to. Few of the answers simply endorsed or opposed a particular policy or strategy, most commenting on existing services or pointing out omissions or areas for improvement. Many of the responses related to specific locations or lengths of road rather than the strategic issues the consultation was about.

B.19 Of the 401 questionnaire responses, 296 had additional comments in response to Q4. The following main points were made:

- 71 respondents supported improvements in the **bus** network, level of service, fleet and facilities, and cheaper or concessionary fares
- 53 respondents took the opportunity to reinforce their support for congestion reducing measures in **Melton Mowbray**, including construction of a bypass or ring road
- There were 35 responses raising concern at the lack of reference to **rail services**. 13 of these specifically referred to completing the Ivanhoe rail line
- **Cycling and walking** was a concern to 32 respondents, who supported improvements in the standards adopted and facilities offered, the level of maintenance, segregation between walkers and cyclists and the coverage of the network. 3 stated that these concerns put them off cycling
- There were 24 responses relating to **traffic calming**, with most opposing it and the use of vertical features. 6 responses were supportive of traffic calming near schools
- There were 20 responses relating to **motorcycles and mopeds**. Most felt that this should have formed part of the consultation, and there were 5 requests for motorcycles and mopeds to be allowed to share bus lanes
- The impact on communities from **freight** was highlighted by 26 respondents, of which 7 were specifically concerned with Melton Mowbray
- Issues relating to the control of car traffic to and from **work and school** were raised by 11 respondents, supporting workplace charging, home working, flexible working hours, car sharing, safer routes to school and 'walking buses'
- **Road signs, signals and marking** were an issue with 18 respondents. 5 were specific to Melton Mowbray and 3 to Loughborough. Most location-specific comments wanted improvements to traffic signal phasing, with other comments pointing out road sign clutter or requesting clearer and less growth-obstructed signs and greater use of cats' eyes on unlit roads
- 9 comments were received asking for better **maintenance** or surfacing on roads and footways
- There was opposition to the use of **safety cameras** in 8 responses
- The effect of traffic on **noise and air quality** was a widespread concern, mentioned by 17 responses either in a general context, as a consequence of traffic calming or bus lanes, or as a problem in a specific location, though 26 more were connected with the impact of freight, and analysed in that category. 3 more responses suggested that increased use of motorcycles and mopeds would contribute to a reduction in pollution

- There were 3 requests for a western bypass around Lutterworth and 3 requests for the completion of the **Leicester ring road** (Eastern District Distributor Road).

‘Leicestershire’s Voice’ Citizens’ Panel

B.20 Over autumn and early winter 2004 we put the same consultation questions before the ‘Leicestershire’s Voice’ Citizens’ Panel.

Q1: What priority do you think should be given to each objective?

	High	Medium	Low	Not a priority	No response
	%	%	%	%	%
Tackling congestion	64	29	4	1	2
Improving access to facilities	32	48	14	3	3
Improving air quality and reducing the impact of traffic	51	37	9	1	2
Reducing road accident casualties	73	20	4	1	2
Maintaining our roads and pavements in good condition	64	32	2	1	1

B.21 Applying the same calculation as for Question 1 of the questionnaire, responses provide the following results:

Casualty reduction:	2.68	Air quality / traffic impact:	2.40
Maintenance:	2.62	Accessibility:	2.12
Congestion:	2.59		

B.22 The analysis resulted in a very similar spread of scoring priorities as that from the questionnaires. However, there is a difference in priority order, with casualty reduction and maintenance having a slightly increased priority in the Citizens' Panel and congestion and air quality/reducing the impact of traffic receiving a slightly lower priority.

Q2: How far do you agree or disagree that our proposals are the best way to achieve each objective?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Tackling congestion	28	48	16	4	1	3
Improving access to facilities	28	45	16	7	2	2
Improving air quality and reducing the impact of traffic	24	46	16	9	2	3
Reducing road accident casualties	18	45	24	9	1	3
Maintaining our roads and pavements in good condition	12	48	31	6	1	2

B.23 As with the responses from Question 2 of the completed questionnaire, there is general support that our proposals are the best way to achieve the objectives. However, there was a significantly smaller ‘no response’ which means all measures have a higher percentage of people who support the proposals. The most notable difference proportionally is that the

Citizens' Panel ranked accessibility higher and maintenance lower than the questionnaire respondents.

Q3: What priority do you think should be given to our larger schemes?

	High	Medium	Low	Not a priority	No response
	%	%	%	%	%
Loughborough Inner Relief Road	21	40	17	9	13
Melton Mowbray congestion relief	22	40	16	10	12
Kibworth Bypass	12	38	23	12	15
M1 junction 21 area improvements	49	27	10	4	10
Lorry route bypasses	44	32	9	4	11
Cycle network	36	30	16	11	7
Bus corridors	43	29	13	8	7

B.24 The most notable difference in Question 3 between the questionnaire and Citizens' Panel is the response for Melton Mowbray measures, which had a lower priority with the Citizens' Panel response.

B.25 From the more detailed analysis of the Citizens' Panel, 92% of Charnwood residents say the Loughborough Inner Relief Road should be a priority (compared with 74% of non-Charnwood residents), and 95% of Melton residents think congestion relief measures for Melton Mowbray should be a priority (compared with 76% of non-Melton residents).

Q4: Do you have any other comments on the proposals?

B.26 As with the questionnaire, respondents were given the opportunity to offer any comments on the proposals they read about in the questionnaire. Two thirds made no additional comment. Improved alternatives to car transport such as trams, better bus services or park and ride were mentioned by 13% of respondents overall. The reduction of congestion on roads in general, for example by introducing bypasses, was mentioned by 5%. 3% of respondents suggested that traffic speeds should be managed by the introduction of speed cameras and speed tables. However, a greater number (4%) suggested that such measures are themselves a source of congestion.

Letters

B.27 In addition to the questionnaire responses we received 66 letters. These were predominantly the responses from the groups who received presentations, and other groups and bodies to whom consultation information had been sent. This included 17 parish and town councils and the 7 Leicestershire borough and district councils. 20 letters were received from other groups and individuals.

B.28 This section provides a general summary of responses. A specific summary of district council responses is dealt with later.

- 18 respondents supported the construction of bypasses and relief roads, with Lutterworth Western Relief Road (5 responses), Loughborough Inner Relief Road (4 responses) and Melton Mowbray Bypass (4 responses) specifically mentioned
- 18 respondents supported the need for congestion reduction measures
- 15 respondents, of whom 5 specifically referred to progressing the Ivanhoe line, were concerned at the absence of rail issues in the consultation

- 15 respondents supported improving the bus network and level of service
- 13 respondents were concerned with reducing the impact of HGVs
- 13 respondents supported improving and extending cycling facilities
- 9 respondents referred to the need to improve highway safety
- 9 respondents referred to the need to improve air quality.

B.29 Smaller numbers of responses were received in connection with appropriate land-use planning to reduce the need to travel (6 responses), requests for individual minor road improvements (6 responses), pedestrian facilities, speeding traffic and accessibility of facilities (5 responses each). Parking facilities (cars and HGVs), air travel (impact of air travel per se and access to / traffic impact of the East Midlands Airport), park and ride (general support, as well as objecting to specific location), safety cameras, environmental issues and support for school travel plans totalled 17 responses between them.

District Councils

B.30 All the Leicestershire district councils made written responses to the consultation, with some also submitting responses to the specific questions 1-3 in the questionnaire. The individual responses, as might be expected, focused on areas of local concern. The main issues raised by each council are shown below.

Blaby District Council

B.31 Support for:

- Bus priority / star trak for routes into Leicester
- High priority for the M1 J21 area study
- Bypasses for villages on lorry routes – Sharnford, Sapcote and Stoney Stanton were identified
- New passenger rail station at Blaby.

B.32 Opposition to:

- Park and ride sites at M1 J21 and Glenfield
- Passenger rail station at Kirby Muxloe.

Charnwood Borough Council

B.33 Support for

- Public transport and demand management as an alternative to car travel
- Improving the attractiveness of the Ivanhoe Stage 1 rail service
- Completing Loughborough Inner Relief Road
- Reducing HGV impact in SE Charnwood and the Wolds villages
- Leicester West Park and Ride, subject to parking capacity criteria at Birstall.

Harborough District Council

B.34 Support for

- Addressing air quality, traffic impact and congestion issues in Lutterworth and Market Harborough
- Improving access to facilities
- Casualty reduction as a high priority in specified locations, particularly vehicle-activated signs, pedestrian and cyclist measures, safety measures and shared spaces
- Targeting maintenance towards rural HGV routes
- Reduction in HGV activity in Lutterworth, and provision of Lutterworth Western Relief Road
- Kibworth Bypass as a high priority
- Lorry route bypasses, cycle network completions and quality bus corridors, if focussed on the Harborough county towns and the southern approach to Leicester
- Completion of the Leicester outer ring road to address rat-running problems in Thurnby and Stoughton.

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

B.35 Support for:

- School travel plans
- Improved co-ordination of road works
- Rededication of National Forest (Ivanhoe) rail line to passenger use, and integrated ticketing
- Cross-boundary working with other authorities
- Earl Shilton Bypass as a high priority
- Referred to Hinckley Town Centre Renaissance Masterplan, available late 2005.

B.36 Opposition to:

- Loughborough / Central Leicestershire focus of proposals
- Abortive traffic calming which is later removed – explore alternatives, innovate.

Melton Borough Council

B.37 Support for:

- Traffic congestion scheme in Melton Mowbray
- Melton Mowbray Bypass.

B.38 Opposition to

- Loughborough / Central Leicestershire focus of proposals
- Abortive traffic calming which is later removed – explore alternatives, innovate.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council

B.39 Support for:

- Pedestrian schemes in Wigston and Oadby town centres
- Blaby – South Wigston cycle path
- Road improvements: A5199, A6, B582, B5418, B5366, B5403
- School and workplace travel plans for the whole borough
- Reliable, accessible buses, and more frequent trains.

North West Leicestershire District Council

B.40 Support for:

- Reopening of National Forest (Ivanhoe) Line to passenger traffic
- Improvement of transport links to East Midlands Airport
- Improved penetration of Coalville by local buses
- Early completion of Kegworth Bypass.

Highways Forums

B.41 Presentations were made to the 7 Highways Forums in Leicestershire. A summary of the comments made is shown below.

Blaby Highways Forum

- Support for the ongoing cycling work
- M1 J21 area: Query on effectiveness of anti-skid surfacing, and reduction in lanes coming off the motorway
- Orbital bus routes around Leicester should be improved as well as radials
- The LTP should identify potential lorry route bypasses
- Query over the prospect of completing Leicester's outer ring road
- The links between the LTP and the Blaby Air Quality Action Plan should be maintained.

Charnwood Highways Forum

- Priority within the larger schemes should be given to Loughborough Inner Relief Road
- Request that more school buses and staggered school opening hours should be considered to tackle school-related congestion
- Concern that Loughborough town, rather than the rural areas of Charnwood, was the focus of the County Council's attention
- Stressed the public's wish for the Council to be seen to be promoting exciting, potentially risky schemes
- Alternatives to car travel should be developed, and the Loughborough-Leicester rail service needs to be emphasised in the LTP

- Concern over air quality.

Harborough Highways Forum

- Support for an A6 park & ride site south of Leicester
- Concern over air pollution in Lutterworth
- Concern over footway maintenance in villages.

Hinckley and Bosworth Highways Forum

- Query over the nature of 'deprived' groups in an accessibility sense
- Concern over whether the LTP would address car parking on verges
- Emphasis on the need to encourage walking, and to address the conflict between walkers and motorised users of green lanes
- Concern over the effects of M1 widening on the surrounding feeder roads
- Stressed the importance of reviewing public transport, and the desirability of increased County Council influence over public transport companies
- Stressed the importance of the County performing well and obtaining value for money.

Melton Highways Forum

- Concern over the low profile of Melton in the larger schemes programme
- Concern over the traffic effects on Melton Mowbray of present commercial activities and future development, and suggestion for a relief road
- Need for a Melton Mowbray Bypass and interim congestion measures
- Raised problems of rural transport links (specifically to Bottesford), and the impact of unreliable buses and trains.

North West Leicestershire Highways Forum

- Concern that no reference was made to the Ivanhoe Line in the consultation document
- Concern over lack of cycling development in North West Leicestershire
- Question on school travel plans and cycling proficiency
- Requested a statement on Kegworth Bypass in the LTP
- Safety concerns on the A42
- The County and District Councils should work together on LTP development and taxi licensing statements
- Queries over street lighting policy on motorways.

Oadby and Wigston Highways Forum

- Public transport should be more accessible, particularly to the hospitals, to encourage modal change
- Concern over poor bus and train services in the borough

-
- Pressed for all borough schools to produce travel plans
 - Bus companies should produce a map showing the routes of the individual providers' services
 - Proposed an intelligent off-bus integrated ticketing system
 - General concern over congested roads.

Single-issue response via the Melton Times

B.42 During December 2004 the Melton Times ran a campaign in support of a Melton Mowbray Bypass, encouraging readers to support a Melton Mowbray Bypass via coupons printed in the newspaper with space for the respondent's name, address and postcode. The coupons were all returned to the Melton Times offices, and delivered to the County Council by hand on the closing date of the LTP consultation. 622 coupons were returned in all.

B.43 However, although submitted as a result of the LTP consultation, and within the consultation timescale, the campaign only focussed on one issue, without reference to the other elements in the consultation document, and so can only properly be considered as a petition. Consequently, the response has not been counted alongside the feedback from the LTP consultation.

B.44 Nevertheless, the issue is clearly a matter of considerable local concern, and consultation specific to a Melton Mowbray Bypass took place at the end of February 2005.

Stage 2 LTP consultation

Introduction

B.45 This section of the appendix summarises Stage 2 of the LTP2 consultation and its associated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), from 26 September to 12 December 2005. The aim was to ensure that all users of the transport system (or their representatives), and especially our main stakeholders, had the opportunity to express their views on the proposals in the Provisional second Local Transport Plan, and on whether changes should be made in the light of the SEA. The consultation was organised to meet the requirements in the Department for Transport's LTP guidance, in the SEA European Directive, and the County Council's own consultation standards.

B.46 The Strategic Environmental Assessment considered the impact on the environment of the measures set out in the LTP. Based on the findings of the SEA an Environmental Report was produced, which made recommendations on issues to incorporate into the development and implementation of the final LTP. The SEA and Environmental Report work was carried out independently of the LTP production by the Environmental Action Team in the County Council's Community Services department. The main recommendations centred around:

- Integration of environmental objectives into the Transport Asset Management Plan Review
- Monitoring the quality of roadside verges for nature conservation
- Maximised use of recycled materials in transport works
- Good quality buses to avoid the air quality impacts of modal shift
- Environmentally-sensitive scheme design
- Early consultation with environmental experts on all schemes

- Continued air quality monitoring
- Budgeted marketing / promotion of sustainable travel in the county.

B.47 The SEA Guidance requires a statement covering, amongst other things, how the LTP was amended in response to the information in the Environmental Report, and how the consultation responses were taken into account.

Stage 2 consultation process

B.48 Stage 2 of the consultation took a similar approach to that taken for Stage 1 in 2004 on the Provisional LTP strategy, and consisted of:

- A general press release informing of the consultation and where further information was available
- Presentations to the Leicestershire District Highways Forums
- Production of a consultation document summarising the Provisional LTP and SEA, and including a feedback questionnaire for return
- Inclusion of the same information and an online version of the questionnaire on the Leicestershire County Council website
- An article in the autumn 2005 Leicestershire Matters, which is distributed to all households in the County, including details of how and where to get a copy of the leaflet, and encouraging people to use the questionnaire to let us know their views
- Sending out a total of around 5700 consultation documents, including 91 to members of Local Strategic Partnerships (4 LSPs were sent links to the consultation internet home page), 53 to other stakeholders including the 7 district councils, and some 5500 leaflets to all our 229 parish councils and 73 libraries and local authority service shops.

B.49 The questionnaire at the end of the consultation document sought opinion on the balance of expenditure over the measures proposed, the level of achievability of the targets, whether amendments to the LTP need to be made in the light of the SEA, and any other comments on the LTP.

Summary of consultation responses

B.50 The remainder of this report summarises the response and draws some conclusions.

B.51 The responses to consultation have been broken down into

- Summary of responses from the questionnaire, and from separate letters
- Summary of responses from district councils
- Summary of key points made at the District Highways Forums.

Summary of questionnaire responses

B.52 In total 132 completed questionnaires were received, 111 through the post and 21 online. 63 letters and e-mails were also received.

B.53 A significant number of replies were encouraged by the Lutterworth Improvement Partnership in support of measures to relieve congestion and pollution in Lutterworth town

centre, so that these form a disproportionate number of the replies. At least 40 of the 132 questionnaire responses were from Lutterworth residents.

B.54 Analysis of the questionnaires showed that many people wrote their own unrelated comments in the spaces provided rather than answer the relevant question. The truest reflection of opinion therefore comes from the open 'other comments' question (Q8) or the letters, which are dealt with in the next part of this report.

Q1: Do you think we should be spending more on any particular measures? If so, which ones and why?

Yes		No		No answer	
81	61%	14	11%	37	28%

Suggestions for greater expenditure:

- Addressing air quality levels (17 respondents), especially in Lutterworth (6) and Kegworth (5)
- Improvements to the coverage of the bus network, the frequency, speed and reliability of the bus service, the bus fleet and passenger facilities, and lower, more flexible fares with more concessions (15 respondents)
- Addressing congestion levels (13 respondents), especially in Lutterworth (5) and Kegworth (3)
- 11 respondents specified support for construction of the Lutterworth Western Relief Road. Bypasses supported by fewer respondents were Kegworth (3 respondents), Kibworth (1), Melton (1) and Syston eastern (1)
- 3 respondents used this question to press for the reinstatement of the Leicester-Burton rail line
- Significant issues of concern are air quality and congestion in Lutterworth (to which Lutterworth Western Relief Road is seen as a solution by many) and Kegworth. Significant concerns, as ever, were bus-related: improved network, and hours, speed, frequency and reliability.

Q2: Do you think we should be spending less on any particular measures? If so, which ones and why?

Yes		No		No answer	
49	37%	37	28%	46	35%

Suggestions for reduced expenditure:

- Park and ride services and bus lanes were seen as unduly expensive and under-used by 7 respondents
- 7 respondents were opposed to spending on traffic calming in general (5) and vertical features in particular (2)
- There was opposition to major schemes (10 respondents) - Loughborough Inner Relief Road (4), Melton Bypass (2), Lutterworth Western Relief Road (2) and Earl Shilton Bypass (2) - mainly on environmental, locational or effectiveness grounds.

Q3: To what extent do you agree that we are spending the right amount on each objective?

Strongly agree		Agree		No opinion		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Not answered	
0	0%	19	14%	14	11%	38	29%	11	8%	50	39%

This finding reflects the wide range of views noted above.

Q4: Are there any targets you think should be more challenging? If so, which ones and why?

Yes		No		No answer	
68	52%	15	11%	49	37%

Suggestions for more challenging targets:

- 16 respondents felt we should challenge ourselves more on bus service provision, particularly on the network and service standards
- Air quality was seen by 10 respondents as an area for attention
- 9 respondents wanted to see a greater challenge on traffic congestion, with particular reference to Kegworth, Melton Mowbray and Lutterworth
- 8 respondents wanted to see greater progress on traffic impact reduction, with particular emphasis on village traffic calming
- 6 respondents pushed for a greater challenge on major schemes at Lutterworth (4 responses) and Kegworth (2).

Q5: Are there any targets you think are too challenging? If so, which ones and why?

Yes		No		No answer	
18	14%	53	40%	61	46%

Only a very small number of people made suggestions in this section, but the main ones were road casualties (it was felt that they would reduce on their own if car use was reduced), car usage, congestion (unachievable without road user charging in Leicester) and Melton Mowbray Bypass (little prospect of government support)

Q6: To what extent do you agree with the levels of targets set?

Strongly agree		Agree		No opinion		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Not answered	
0	0%	22	17%	17	13%	27	20%	10	8%	56	42%

As in Q3, more people who expressed an opinion disagreed with the target levels than agreed, although the percentage of non-respondents was even higher here.

Q7: Do you think we should amend any elements of the programme as a result of the Environmental Report? If so, which and how?

Yes		No		No answer	
52	39%	23	17%	57	43%

Suggestions for environmental amendments:

- The greatest number of suggestions for amendments (from 8 respondents) was the encouragement of passenger rail transport, with an emphasis on the Leicester-Burton link
- 5 respondents suggested improvements to the bus network and park and ride
- Support for the Lutterworth Western Relief Road was pressed for by 5 respondents and Kegworth Bypass by 1
- Other suggestions were amendments relating to air quality, particularly in Lutterworth and Loughborough (5 responses) and rural/heritage issues (4 responses)
- Shifts in spending were advocated by 4 respondents under this heading, away from Leicester and Loughborough and towards Lutterworth, improved bus, cycle and walking networks, and the rural areas
- More sustainable transport modes (rail, park and ride) are clearly seen by many as the way to address environmental concerns.

Q8: Do you have any other comments?

This open question allowed respondents to make any remarks they wished, and was in many cases used to reiterate points made in the comment areas of other questions, or address issues at specific locations. 108 of the 132 questionnaires returned included comments. These are summarised as:

- 21 respondents were concerned at air quality levels, the majority (13) in Lutterworth, but to a small extent in Kegworth as well
- 20 responses were received regarding Lutterworth Western Relief Road. Very similar numbers gave opinions for (11) and against (9) - opposition was in most cases based on the proximity of the route to residential areas
- 18 responses expressed concern over the impact of lorries in towns and villages, with a heavy weighting (10) citing Lutterworth as the main concern
- The same number (18) were concerned at levels of congestion, with the same proportion referring to Lutterworth, although these were not the same respondents
- Bus travel in general was commented on by 10 respondents, with the majority in favour of network, service and facilities improvements. Specific reference was made to Loughborough bus facilities by some, and 1 respondent argued against special disabled transport, arguing that the mainstream service should be accessible to all.

Letters

B.55 In addition to the questionnaire responses, 63 letters and e-mails were received from 25 individuals, 20 stakeholder groups, 3 town councils, 9 parish councils and 6 district councils. Many of these were responses from the groups and bodies to whom consultation information had been sent.

B.56 This section provides a general summary of responses. A specific summary of district council responses is dealt with later.

- Bus transport was a concern of 15 respondents, supporting a wider / improved network, a faster, more frequent and more reliable service with longer hours, and more flexible and concessionary fares, including through ticketing

- There were very significant concerns (15 respondents) over air quality levels, with over half (8) focussing on Lutterworth, and 2 on Kegworth
- A significant body of opinion (13 respondents) pressed for more and improved rail services, with particular emphasis (10) on the Leicester-Burton line
- In the letters there was a less even split than in the questionnaires between proponents and opponents of the Lutterworth Western Relief Road, with 8 for and 4 against. The reason for opposing the scheme in most cases was once again the proximity to residential areas. Other bypasses and relief roads supported were Kegworth (2) and Burton on the Wolds (2)
- 9 respondents were in favour of cycling measures, with most wanting to improve the network coverage
- There was concern (9 responses) over levels of traffic congestion, with most letters (6) identifying Lutterworth as the main concern
- 7 respondents expressed concern over freight levels in villages on lorry routes, with some support (2) for rail freight. There was a request from Northamptonshire County Council to review the A5199 south of the A4304 as part of the Leicestershire lorry route network, as it causes problems south of the border with Northamptonshire in Welford village
- Smaller numbers of responses (5 or 6 each) were received in connection with traffic calming, maintenance issues, road safety and links with other policies and strategies.

District Councils

B.57 The individual responses, as in Stage 1 of the consultation, focussed on areas of local concern, and are summarised below.

Blaby District Council

- Does not share the County Council's view that Earl Shilton Bypass should be given priority, as it would reap none of the commercial benefits but many of the negative impacts. The District Council would rather see investment redirected towards congestion in the M1 Junction 21 area and reducing the impact of traffic more widely over the County e.g. environmental work at Narborough Road South
- Supports in principle the proposed passenger railway station at Blaby - how it would be funded and timescale for implementation need to be clarified
- Supports the LTP conclusions on the Narborough Road South AQMA, but should the air quality threshold be exceeded following real-time monitoring, corrective measures and funding should be included in the LTP, for this and any other confirmed AQMAs
- Feels that a wider range of measures to address road traffic noise / vibration are needed, with consideration given to the Environmental Noise Directive implications
- Whilst recognising the wider potential congestion and air quality benefits of park and ride in general, reserves its position on not supporting the inclusion of a scheme in the M1 Junction 21 area in the LTP, pending its response in January 2006 to a site specific public consultation, for which it has requested a traffic impact assessment and environmental impact assessment
- Feels that the congestion target should relate to the p.m. peak as well as a.m.
- Feels that the casualty reduction target should be year on year, not just 2010

-
- Feels that the traffic impact target should refer to traffic noise and vibration, as well as to speed. A more challenging target than a 'majority' of people is needed for the impact of traffic target
 - Feels that, due to the congestion, air pollution and accident problems in the area, J21 improvements should continue to be identified as a single large scheme, as in Stage 1 of the consultation, with high priority, and identified funding and programme.

Charnwood Borough Council

- Welcomes the Loughborough Town Centre Transport Project, improvements to main bus corridors and the Loughborough and Central Leicestershire cycle networks, and speed reduction and traffic calming in communities with traffic-related problems
 - Asks that air quality consequences of Loughborough Inner Relief Road be minimised in the vicinity of the route, and local concerns over traffic impact adjacent to the route be addressed
 - Is of the opinion that new development in the Loughborough Sub-Regional Centre and the Leicester Principal Urban Area, in line with guidance for regional planning and the emerging Charnwood Local Development Framework, will need public and private investment in supporting transport infrastructure and demand management measures
 - Considers the traffic growth projections in the LTP to be unsustainable, and feels the LTP should put in place a longer-term strategy to deliver progressive traffic growth reduction and improvement in air quality with more emphasis on
 - improving the frequency, coverage and availability of bus services to main destinations, notably leisure centres, to provide a real alternative to the car
 - significantly improving park and ride and walking and cycling facilities, especially in areas with the worst traffic problems
 - comprehensive coverage of travel plans, and the introduction of pricing mechanisms to constrain car use and provide income to fund new infrastructure and better services for non-car modes
 - reducing emissions by encouraging the use of more efficient, better-maintained vehicles
 - Suggests that, with district councils, the County Council should monitor and investigate variations in air quality from the national forecasts, and develop potential LTP-funded solutions
 - Feels that more resources should be devoted to school and workplace travel plans in Syston, pending a long-term sustainable integrated solution to air quality and traffic problems in the town
 - Considers that significant road building, including bypasses, should be considered only where justified as part of a sustainable integrated solution to traffic-related problems, or where it is the only means of resolving specific and significant identified local problems, and where it causes no serious problems elsewhere on the road network
 - Urges alleviation of HGV - related problems in the Wolds villages and other rural areas of Charnwood, by packages of measures benefiting all affected communities if HGV re-routing is not an option
 - Wants measures to be implemented which enable motorcycles / powered two-wheelers to offer a safe and realistic travel choice.
-

Harborough District Council

- Considers that the overall impact of the initiatives, and the selection and prioritisation process, are unclear
- In spite of the recognition the LTP gives to the economic consequences of traffic congestion, sees that there are no proposals in this area for Lutterworth, and the Western Relief Road should be the highest priority for Harborough district, as it contributes to congestion, air quality, traffic impact and quality of life objectives
- Points out that no consideration has been given to a western bypass of Market Harborough, and a full transport assessment of the town is needed to address the infrastructure requirements of committed and future development necessary for the town's continued economic viability
- Notes that there is no declared support for Market Harborough's St Mary's Road Regeneration Project, with its highway and rail accessibility benefits, although other regeneration areas in Loughborough and South Wigston are recognised as needing County Council support
- Is disappointed that A6 Park and Ride into Leicester from the south is not included, as it would have linked into the express suburban service proposed from Oadby into Leicester. The Quality Bus Corridor Initiatives listed are welcome, though there is no corridor in Harborough district
- Feels that dialogue with the District Council is needed on the nature of the Market Hall public transport interchange in Market Harborough
- Welcomes the X61 / 33 bus stop upgrades
- Feels the LTP needs to acknowledge that the document will need to be reviewed as future development requirements are agreed, as the Structure Plan housing requirements will be superseded by the adoption of the new Regional Plan, with consequent uncertainty over the currently predicted scale and pattern of transport-related activity
- Cautions that the East Leicestershire Rural Transport Partnership will need sustained and secure funding to ensure delivery of its initiatives.

An extensive analysis of the Provisional LTP was also included in the response.

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

- Requests LTP support on a broader basis of the initiatives in the Hinckley and Bosworth car parking strategy, to promote Hinckley town centre regeneration
- Welcomes J21 Park and Ride proposal, and considers that it should be a priority
- Welcomes the School Travel Plan target
- Is concerned at the apparent lack of similar commitment to workplace travel plans
- Feels that the congestion relief role of local rail has been 'underplayed', and wants a higher priority given to it, with greater capital expenditure and not just partnership. The improvement of Hinckley station, and its integration with other modes, is a main part of the Hinckley Masterplan
- Although welcoming the reference in the LTP to the Hinckley QBP, is concerned that there is no justification for limiting improvements to 'small scale', as Hinckley and its environs have a population exceeding 60,000. The QBP work will be key to the Hinckley Master plan, and it would like details on the extent of the improvements

- Considers the National Forest line to be of merit, but of less priority than other projects in the Provisional LTP
- Understands the Central Leicestershire and Loughborough focus of cycle improvements until 2011, but feels that this disadvantages districts such as Hinckley and Bosworth, with a population of over 60,000 in the Hinckley urban area. Developer contributions should where appropriate be levered in to fund improvements in Hinckley and Bosworth, using the cycle network plan that has already been prepared as a basis. It would furthermore strongly welcome the cycle route along the Ashby Canal being promoted
- Notes that there was no specific reference to Hinckley and Bosworth interchanges - again, Hinckley bus and rail station improvements are integral to the Masterplan, and mention should be made of this within the interchange section of the LTP
- Supports the varied approach to managing speed, although there is no specific mention of traffic calming measures. It maintained its Stage 1 comments on traffic calming, and encouraged innovative methods to be pursued, alongside other special management methods
- Endorses the approach to air quality
- Welcomes the continuing support for Earl Shilton Bypass, urging effort to be made to secure funding and completion as soon as possible. Funding for town centre improvements needs to be found as well, to redress the negative effects high volumes of traffic have had on the town, and to encourage cycling and walking in the town
- Welcomes the approach to transport asset management
- As concerned that there is insufficient reference to the Hinckley Master plan, and summarised its main points, emphasising its consistency with all the LTP objectives, appending to the response a summary of its transport implications, and requesting funding to be identified in the later stages of the LTP
- Considers rural transport requires serious consideration in the LTP to ensure rural communities have access to facilities in the Borough

Melton Borough Council

- Welcomes the LTP, especially the proposals for a Melton Mowbray ring road in the longer term, with an initial bypass to be constructed in the next LTP period. Wants preparation work to begin as soon as possible, as detailed alignment proposals will be needed for the Melton Local Development Framework consultation process. Details will be needed before the proposed 2008/09 date to fit in with the publication of the Local Development Framework Issues and Options Development Plan Document in October 2006. The Borough Council therefore expects a higher priority for a prepared bypass scheme in the final LTP

North West Leicestershire District Council

- Felt that the statements on the Leicester-Burton rail line 'barely kept alive' the ambition to reintroduce a passenger service, and asked that the LTP include in its Tackling Congestion section an action to pressure Central Government to introduce a better financial regime to help the reintroduction of passenger services such as this. Safeguarding the route would be an issue for the LDF. It noted that, unlike earlier proposals, there was no mention of a stop gap Leicester-Burton bus service in the interim, and considered that the inter-urban bus service along the National Forest Line corridor should now be reconsidered for upgrading

- Considered that the current poor bus/rail interchange to Ashby and Coalville at Leicester Rail Station was impeding public transport accessibility
- Wished to consider reducing the number of bus termini in Coalville to 1, as the current 2 impedes interchange and reduces public transport penetration into the town centre
- Considered that county towns such as Coalville and Ashby could benefit from the kind of safe cycling improvements proposed for Loughborough and Central Leicestershire
- Considered that employers should be brought together to develop more comprehensive travel planning in particular areas (e.g. Nottingham East Midlands Airport and Bardon)
- Pointed out the gap in the hourly bus network between Ashby / Coalville and NEMA and northern North West Leicestershire, and considered that such a link would improve employment accessibility at Nottingham East Midlands Airport
- Welcomed proposals to strengthen the network of transport schemes for disabled people, reduce gaps in the pedestrian network and improve street lighting
- Asked that the County Council be asked to maximise as far as it could the proportion of funding allocated to local road safety schemes
- Felt that the lack of progress on traffic calming in Ashby-de-la-Zouch town centre inhibited the maximisation of benefits to the town centre derived from construction of the Bypass, and would undermine the future of the town centre
- Suggested that the Bardon Roundabout to Coalville section of A511 should be included in any list of future bypass proposals, and that other settlements within the district were also possible candidates. The alternative to identifying individual schemes would be to specify qualifying criteria for assessing such schemes, without listing them.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council were sent the consultation details, but resource issues prevented the Borough from making a formal response.

Meeting with District Councils, January 2006

B.58 As a follow-up to the written consultation, a meeting was held at County Hall on 25th January 2006 with officers from all the district councils, to discuss district concerns with the LTP. It was clear from the meeting that all supported the position that transport proposals should be developed in an integrated way alongside town centre proposals and other developments in their Local Development Frameworks, particularly to support the vitality of the county towns.

Highways forums

B.59 Presentations were made to the 7 Highways Forums in Leicestershire. The comments made at the forums are summarised below.

Blaby Highways Forum

- Was concerned over how the transport policy helps people on a low income
- Required an explanation as to why Loughborough's air quality cannot be addressed without a major scheme
- Highlighted a specific gap in bus service provision between Fosse Park and Whetstone

- Was concerned that the County Council reduce the problem of cars blocking roads around schools
- Raised specific congestion issues along Little Glen Road
- Wanted to know what consideration there had been in the LTP process of orbital bus routes as opposed to radial routes

Charnwood Highways Forum

- Supported the Loughborough major scheme
- Raised concern over the Air Quality Management Area and lorry routes in Syston
- Felt that the consultation document misled people into thinking that more could be done for congestion than was possible
- Raised concerns over problems on the A6 caused by the school run, and raised the possibility of using traffic wardens during school hours to enforce traffic regulation
- Highlighted the problem of increasing motorcycle accidents
- Raised concerns over traffic speeds and possible control measures in villages
- Suggested dealing with traffic problems through increased bus usage and the use of statutory Quality Bus Partnerships

Hinckley and Bosworth Highways Forum

- Raised concerns over casualty levels on the A5
- Wanted an increase in the number of yellow school buses
- Welcomed the emphasis in the LTP of liaison with motorcycle groups, and the targeting of motorcycle casualties
- Welcomed the emphasis on the conservation aspects of roadside verge maintenance
- Supported 20 mph areas outside schools, pressing for improvements at a particular site, and emphasised the need for parental education on safety around schools
- Felt the County Council had not promoted rail travel sufficiently
- Doubted that there would be sufficient resources for all the required traffic calming schemes, and wanted to know whether road humps would still be promoted.

Melton Highways Forum

- With regard to Melton Mowbray Bypass, was concerned that development in the town would suffer through lack of a bypass; pressed for a route to be identified in case funds become available, and to allow development on the perimeter of the town, and in any case by October 2006 to inform the Local Development Framework process
- Requested an explanation as to why the Loughborough Inner Relief Road was needed to improve air quality
- Expressed concern at traffic speeds within Melton, and suggested that all roads within the town be subject to either 20 mph or 30 mph speed limits; supported vehicle-activated signs, especially on routes into Melton and on the Nottingham Road / St. Bartholomew's Way junction.

North West Leicestershire Highways Forum

- Emphasised the balance needed between increased accessibility and quality of life
- Was concerned that the LTP was not looking to increase rail facilities
- Pushed for more funds to be allocated to road safety schemes
- Supported 20 mph areas near schools, and asked for the roll-out of these to be accelerated
- Criticised the way the LTP had been put together: it displayed little imagination (especially with regard to the economic regeneration possibilities of the Leicester-Burton rail line) and was centred on Central Leicestershire and Loughborough
- Highlighted the need for an A511 Bardon Road Bypass in Coalville
- Raised the option of light rail for the Leicester-Burton line
- Suggested that the funds for the J21 Park and Ride would be better spent on the Leicester-Burton rail line
- Suggested that a series of small park and ride sites along a corridor served smaller communities better than 1 large site.

Oadby and Wigston Highways Forum

- Queried the effect on evening and weekend services of a consolidated hourly bus network, and the effect of the star trak system on Oadby and Wigston
- Was concerned over the difficulty in accessing hospitals by bus from the borough, and reminded of the need to take on board Primary Care Trust plans for new health centres when planning new bus services
- Was concerned that the County Council was not intending to provide new bus shelters, and encouraged the improvement of bus shelters as well as bus stops
- Expressed the hope that the concessionary travel scheme could be extended to enable residents to use the system county-wide
- Felt that congestion in the borough needed to be addressed before 2010.

Harborough Highways Forum

- Was concerned that no specific mention was made of cycling casualties, and that the debris on cycleways discouraged cycling
- Felt that school travel plans were laudable but expensive
- Was concerned at the lack of rural bus transport, though encouraged to hear that this was being revisited; supported increasing accessibility to local services for low-income groups (public transport to hospitals in particular); and hoped the Hallaton taxi voucher scheme could be extended to other areas
- Was disappointed that an A6 park and ride site in Oadby was not included in the LTP
- Queried what traffic calming alternatives there were to speed humps/tables
- Felt that the Lutterworth AQMA, regeneration of the town centre and the completion of the Western Distributor Road should be linked
- Queried how much the County should do to address Killed and Seriously Injured accidents, as cars were getting safer

- Queried what could be done to educate motorcyclists, in view of the focus on motorcycle casualties and the advertising in the motorcycling press of 'fast' routes.

Highways Agency response

B.60 The Highways Agency provided a detailed commentary on the relationship of the Provisional LTP's objectives, targets and programmes with the strategic transport network, and on the extent of the Agency's involvement with development of the plan's policies and schemes affecting the strategic transport network.

B.61 In summary:

- The agency noted the linkages with the Regional Spatial and Transport Strategies
- It noted the consistency of the LTP shared objectives with the interests of its own Business Plan; it noted its involvement in, expressed a wish to continue this involvement in, and where appropriate supported, the LTP's strategies to achieve them. It supported the strategies related to improvement of the quality of life and major scheme proposals. It supported the LTP's indicators and targets, expressing its wish to continue being involved in the monitoring process
- It stated its ongoing commitment to the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership, supported continuing joint working, and noted the importance attached by the County Council to a close working relationship with the Agency on land use matters near the trunk road network, particularly the A5 and A46
- It noted the references to improvements to Junction 21 of the M1, confirming an intended start of works in February 2006, and noting the positive impact of the improvement on the M1 AQMAs.
- It confirmed the details quoted in the LTP of the Kegworth Bypass
- It expressed the wish to work with the County Council to ensure appropriately sustainable locations are identified when allocations for developments are being set; it would support allocations that reduce the need to travel by car
- It offered to provide the County Council with details of its 'Influencing Travel Behaviour' programme
- It welcomed early consultation on development matters, was happy to work with the County Council on development control issues, and looked forward to a continuing close working relationship with appropriate authorities on the Local Development Framework process.

Single-issue response - traffic problems in Sharnford

B.62 At the end of the consultation period Sharnford's Traffic Action Group submitted a set of 84 completed questionnaires giving villagers' opinions on the impact of traffic in the village. The questionnaire consisted of 5 questions seeking opinion of different aspects of the effects of traffic in the village, with a section for adding comments, and the responses are summarised:

- 95% of respondents felt that vehicle noise and vibration was a disturbance for many homes
- 92% felt that carriageway and footway widths are too narrow
- All the respondents except 1 felt that conditions were unsafe for children
- Only 6 respondents thought that previous traffic calming had improved matters

- 86% were concerned about the impact of air pollution on health.

B.63 A formal response to the Action Group has been made outside the consultation process.

Strategic Environmental Assessment statutory consultees

B.64 Copies of the Provisional LTP and the SEA, together with the consultation document, were sent to the statutory SEA consultees - the Environment Agency, English Heritage and English Nature. The replies are summarised:

English Nature

- Noting that some LTP proposals had neutral/slightly negative impacts on biodiversity, the agency felt that compensation should be made to achieve a net biodiversity gain, in line with the targets in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands; it was of the opinion that the implementation of the LTP would provide funding opportunities for the agency to implement such compensation.

English Heritage

- Noted in connection with Earl Shilton Bypass that in future care should be taken to preserve examples of ridge and furrow landscape. Other areas of historic landscape to be protected should be identified in the forthcoming Historic Landscape Characterisation Study
- Noted that the comprehensive responses provided by the organisation in January and February 2005 appeared not to have been reflected in the SEA
- Recommended that structures of historic interest (e.g. milestones, crosses and traditional fingerposts) should be taken account of in audits of roadside verges, and historic bridges (as recorded in the County Historic Environment Record) in the TAMP review
- Noted the lack of reference to national guidance such as PPG13 in the SEA, and referred also to the Transport and Traffic Management section in PPG15
- Cautioned that 'routes to school' and cycling schemes, especially in a conservation area, could have adverse townscape character impacts if poorly or insensitively designed
- Suggested that the cultural heritage impact of Earl Shilton Bypass should be amended from 'slightly' to 'moderately' negative, in view of the loss of archaeology of regional significance
- Cautioned that persons with appropriate skills should undertake works on historic structures and other works in sensitive areas to obviate loss/damage
- Gave 2 checklists, originated from the Derbyshire County Council Heritage team, on positive and negative attributes relevant to the landscape, townscape and heritage impact of urban design in sensitive areas.

Environment Agency

- The Agency restricted its response to encouraging the use wherever possible of sustainable drainage, outlining its advantages and giving references to further information.

Conclusion

B.65 Replies have been sent to respondents who asked for one on specific issues, and the views expressed by all respondents have been forwarded for information or action to appropriate operational areas of the County Council.

B.66 The views and opinions expressed in the consultation also form an important part of the evidence base in the final LTP, and have been incorporated into the document as appropriate.

Customer satisfaction with the highways service

B.67 A high priority for us is to produce continuous improvement in customer satisfaction with the highways service. Previously available information on customer satisfaction was limited to scheme-specific data and a more general survey at the time of our best value review that focussed mainly on information issues. To establish a baseline for this we commissioned MORI to carry out a telephone survey for us.

B.68 The questions and responses are set out in the tables below.

Road network condition

B.69 Leicestershire County Council manages and maintains more than 4000 kilometres (approximately 2500 miles) of roads in the County, excluding the M1, M69, A5 and A46 which are maintained by the Highways Agency. This involves regularly inspecting all roads, pavements, road signs and road markings, repairing damage and wear as required and carrying out programmed maintenance to prevent problems occurring.

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall condition of the following elements of the road network managed and maintained in the County of Leicestershire (excluding the City of Leicester)?

	Very satisfied %	Fairly satisfied %	Neither satisfied or dissatisfied %	Fairly dissatisfied %	Very dissatisfied %	Does not apply/ don't know %
a Condition of the roads	15	53	6	15	10	1
b Condition of the pavements	13	47	7	20	12	1
c Condition of road signs	28	55	5	7	3	2
d Condition of road markings	22	56	6	10	5	2
e Condition of the road network overall	18	54	7	13	7	1

Grass verge cutting

B.70 Leicestershire County Council is responsible for cutting the grass on all highway verges, central reservations and islands etc. In urban areas the grass is cut 9 times during the growing season, whilst in rural areas cutting is carried out 3 times to help maintain road safety.

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall maintenance of grass verges in the County of Leicestershire (excluding the City of Leicester)?

	%
Very satisfied	27
Fairly satisfied	49
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4
Fairly dissatisfied	10
Very dissatisfied	8
Does not apply/ don't know	2

Winter salting / gritting

B.71 Leicestershire County Council applies salt / grit, mostly at night, to approximately 45% of roads including all "A" and "B" roads and various other roads to ensure important commuter and bus routes and at least 1 route into all large villages are kept open.

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the salting / gritting service provided in the County of Leicestershire (excluding the City of Leicester)?

	%
Very satisfied	34
Fairly satisfied	44
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5
Fairly dissatisfied	10
Very dissatisfied	6
Does not apply/ don't know	1

Street lighting

B.72 Leicestershire County Council manages and maintains approximately 63,000 streetlights and 11,000 illuminated signs in the County. Broken lights are normally repaired within 4 working days.

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you overall with the Street Lighting provided in the County of Leicestershire (excluding the City of Leicester)?

	%
Very satisfied	45
Fairly satisfied	44
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Fairly dissatisfied	5
Very dissatisfied	2
Does not apply/ don't know	1

Road works information

B.73 Road works are carried out by many different organisations such as gas, water etc. Leicestershire County Council does not have control over these works but they do have a responsibility to co-ordinate planned works where possible, including those that they carry out themselves.

How well do you think road works are managed in the County of Leicestershire (excluding the City of Leicester) to minimise disruption to road users?

	%
Very well managed	11
Fairly well managed	46
Neither	6
Not very well managed	22
Not at all well managed	12
Does not apply / Don't know	3

How well informed do you feel you are kept about road works carried out by Leicestershire County Council excluding the City of Leicester?

	%
Very well informed	14
Fairly well informed	36
Neither	6
Not very well informed	28
Not at all well informed	14
Does not apply / Don't know	3

Customer contact arrangements and systems

B.74 Leicestershire County Council provides a 24 hour freephone contact service (“Roadline”), the Council’s website and a network of service shops for face-to-face contact to report defects and make enquiries about roadworks and related services.

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the customer contact arrangements provided are sufficient to enable you to contact Leicestershire County Council about roads and traffic issues in the County (excluding the City of Leicester) when you need to?

	%
Very satisfied	13
Fairly satisfied	35
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11
Fairly dissatisfied	7
Very dissatisfied	6
Does not apply/ don't know	29

General satisfaction

Taking into account all the above highway services provided, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall service that is provided in the County of Leicestershire (excluding the City of Leicester)?

	%
Very satisfied	18
Fairly satisfied	63
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	7
Fairly dissatisfied	9
Very dissatisfied	3
Does not apply/ don't know	1

Survey notes

- The telephone survey was conducted among residents of Leicestershire between 30 January and 10 February 2005
- Results are based on 1,100 respondents aged 16+ unless otherwise stated
- The sample was drawn using Random Digit Dialling (RDD) by Ipsos MORI, where telephone numbers are randomly generated without contact details or names attached. Around 150 interviews were carried out in each of the 7 Leicestershire district council areas
- Data is weighted to age, gender and work status within each district council area. The overall data is weighted by district population size, using information drawn from the 2003 ONS population estimates
- Where results do not sum to 100%, this is due to computer rounding
- Base: All, unless otherwise specified
- An asterisk (*) indicates a finding of less than .5%, but greater than zero.

Conclusion

B.75 The results of this survey are highly encouraging. As the survey was only completed in February 2006 we have not yet had time to check the figures fully and decide on targets for further improvement over the LTP period. We will do so over the coming months, and use our programme of service delivery improvements to ensure we achieve these.