
CHAPTER 12

Performance management

Introduction and overview

12.1 We must ensure that our programme delivers the required outcomes, and that the effectiveness of individual schemes, and customer satisfaction with them, is properly monitored to ensure we develop best practice in all our areas of activity. At the core of this monitoring is our complete set of performance indicators, targets and trajectories which specify annual milestones for each indicator up until the target is reached.

12.2 This chapter describes the arrangements that we are putting in place for gauging the effectiveness of individual schemes, and our systems for managing and reviewing LTP targets. Under main headings for each of the six LTP objectives, we then present each indicator, target and trajectory. Explanations are given for the chosen baselines and targets, together with monitoring progress against trajectories. For each target we state the key actions required by ourselves and our partners. Also identified are the risks to achieving the targets and how those risks will be managed. The chapter concludes with a reference to regional targets, and the LTP2 mandatory indicators pro-forma.

Implementation of proposals

Programme delivery

12.3 During the first LTP we have worked constantly to improve our management of programme delivery and expenditure. With our maintenance work included, we typically manage the completion of around 700 capital schemes each year. Added to this are the many workstreams which go towards our revenue programme. Each scheme has its own uncertainties and risks which can delay progress or affect costs. Managing the delivery of our programmes is a key activity involving many people and individual processes to ensure satisfactory progress, and these have been outlined in Chapter 11 and elsewhere.

12.4 With the systems now well established, we are well placed to deliver the LTP2 programme to the planned timescales and costs. This aspect of delivery has been a vital feature of our LTP1 annual progress reports, and we have developed our approach to the point where we have achieved the highest possible DfT rating for our delivery performance. In conjunction with this, we have streamlined our approach to programme development and the pursuit of value for money, also as set out in Chapter 11. These aspects of performance management will be crucial in taking forward the LTP and achieving the outcomes which will meet our six objectives.

Scheme outcomes

12.5 Our approach to programme development and delivery would not be robust if we were unable to gauge the success of individual schemes. In some cases, for example casualty reduction schemes, we are able to quantify directly the outcomes by comparing levels of problem before and after the scheme. Even with casualty reduction schemes, however, we normally need three years of accident data with the scheme in place to be sure that the outcome is in line with expectations.

12.6 Quantifying outcomes for most other schemes is less straight-forward, but we are able to gauge success by other means. Our methods include the following:

- Before and after surveys of traffic flows, speeds and delays to buses
- After studies of conditions and attitude surveys amongst users
- Before and after comparisons of bus passenger numbers
- Before and after comparisons of numbers of cyclists
- Follow up consultation with people consulted at the scheme preparation stage
- Anecdotal evidence from local residents, interested parties and regular users.

12.7 We intend to continue monitoring the outcomes of schemes in order to report progress and obtain feedback to assist prioritisation and design of future schemes. This will be combined with our Quality Assurance procedures relating to scheme completion and customer satisfaction.

Indicators and targets

12.8 In Chapters 4 to 9 we set out the indicators we are going to use to measure and monitor our performance towards the achievement of our six objectives. These performance indicators relate as directly as possible to each objective. They can be categorised as:

- **Key outcomes** – the direct quantification of progress towards our LTP objectives
- **Intermediate outcomes** – indicators which quantify the outcomes of individual parts of our strategy towards meeting an LTP objective, for example increasing travel by bus as part of our strategy for tackling congestion
- **Contributory outputs** – indicators which quantify how much we do, for example increasing the number of school travel plans, but not reflecting the effect of such plans on travel behaviour.

12.9 The performance indicators, and the progress we make towards the targets, will be the principal means of demonstrating how successful we are in achieving our six LTP objectives.

Monitoring, management and review systems

12.10 Since our first Best Value Performance Plan in 2000, and our first LTP, we have been developing and improving our systems to ensure that progress towards our targets lies at the heart of all we do.

12.11 Within the County Council we have a structured system of annual performance plans which are fundamental to the management of our key activities. The Best Value Performance Plan sets out the most important corporate performance indicators and targets, including many of the mandatory LTP targets. Below this lies the departmental service plan. All LTP targets are included in our service plan and are subject to a formal risk assessment process. Each performance indicator and its associated target has a named senior officer who is responsible for monitoring and reviewing the target, and all targets are included in staff group action plans to ensure clear accountability and ownership for them.

12.12 The named officer carries out appropriate monitoring of the performance indicator throughout the year. Progress against trajectories is then reported to the department's Strategic Performance Improvement Group (which comprises the most senior officers in the department) three months into each financial year and quarterly thereafter. This allows corrective action to be taken at the earliest opportunity.

12.13 Once a year there is a complete review of all targets to determine whether progress is sufficiently ahead of trajectory to allow it to be made more stretching or whether any more fundamental action is needed where progress has fallen behind trajectory. This system has

been in place for a number of years and its rigorous application was instrumental in our achieving an ‘excellent’ performance score in our fourth Annual Progress Report for LTP1.

Target Setting

12.14 In setting the LTP targets we have sought to ensure they are both challenging and realistic taking account of:

- The final planning guidelines and how in Chapter 11 we distributed funds between the measures
- The evidence and analysis carried out in Chapters 4 to 9, including progress we were able to make during LTP1 where we have comparable performance indicators in LTP2
- The conclusions we drew in Chapter 11 with respect to the realism of our initial aspirational targets
- Comparative analysis of the LTP1 core and LTP2 mandatory indicators of other counties, including their provisional LTP2 targets where these have been set
- National targets where applicable
- DfT criteria for the minimum level of target to be considered either satisfactory or stretching with respect to some mandatory indicators.

12.15 Our comparative analysis is mainly based on the information compiled for the Local Transport Planning Network (LTPN) website and includes data for 36 counties. From the 2005 LTP1 annual progress reports, this shows comparisons of progress for nine core indicators, eight of which are mandatory for LTP2. For the same 36 counties the data includes comparisons of target setting for 12 mandatory indicators in 2005 provisional LTP2s. For our Best Value performance indicators in LTP2, we have also drawn on 2004/05 data for our comparator group of 13 similar counties.

12.16 The remaining sections of this chapter give the details of every performance indicator, and explain the basis for target setting in each case. This includes reference to the above factors where appropriate, with explanations of baseline figures, the sources of data for monitoring progress against trajectories, and the identification of the key risks to target delivery and how those risks will be managed. Whilst the measures being taken to deliver the target are set out in full in chapters 4 to 9, the key interventions are given under each indicator so that the reasoning for the identification of the risks to delivery can be made clear. In a very few cases, firm target setting awaits the availability of data and is not expected by DfT in final LTPs.

Tackling congestion

12.17 The LTP objective is:

Tackling congestion by increasing the use of public transport, walking and cycling with less growth in car mileage and more effective vehicle use of congested road space.

12.18 In Chapter 4 we explained our strategy for achieving this objective, and identified the indicators we will use to quantify and monitor our performance. These are:

- Person journey time in Central Leicestershire
- Vehicle delays in Loughborough
- Bus passenger journeys
- Satisfaction with bus services

- Satisfaction with public transport information
- Bus punctuality at the start of bus routes
- Bus punctuality at intermediate timing points
- Bus punctuality at bus stops between timing points
- School travel by car
- Level of cycling
- School travel plans
- Workplace travel plans.

12.19 Each of these is described under the headings which follow.

Key outcome – person journey time in Central Leicestershire

12.20 This indicator is being introduced in the ten main urban areas of London, the six metropolitan areas, Bristol, Nottingham and Leicester. The target is being developed jointly with the City Council and is also included in the Central Leicestershire LTP. DfT guidance was issued in July 2005 and surveys took place in autumn 2005, with the remainder due in spring 2006. As in the other nine areas, the target will therefore not be established until after completion of LTP2. In the meantime, our provisional target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory	Person journey time per mile on key routes in urban Central Leicestershire	3.95 mins 2004/05	4.26 mins 2010/11

12.21 The selected routes are shown in Figure 12.1 and include the main 9 radial routes into Leicester together with some parts of the outer and central ring roads. Each route is divided into segments which have little variation in vehicle numbers along their length, including bus types and frequencies. DfT vehicle journey time data from ITIS is being used for all vehicles except buses which stop for passengers. The bus journey times, together with the numbers of people in each type of vehicle, are obtained from surveys as specified by DfT guidance. The indicator and target are for travel in the peak direction only between 07:30 and 09:30 in the morning.

12.22 For the provisional baseline and target we have extracted equivalent information from the new Central Leicestershire Transport Model. For the specified routes, the flows of people and their journey times have been extracted from the highway and public transport network assignment for the base year 2004 and 2011 with the complete LTP strategy. Based on this modelling a provisional trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	3.95	4.01	4.06	4.10	4.15	4.20	4.26

12.23 Working closely with the City Council, our key actions include all our proposals for tackling congestion, together with the increased bus patronage from improvements in access to facilities. In our LTP capital programme, this includes the Leicester park and ride, bus corridors and cycle route network, routes to school, better vehicle use of road space and bus improvements. This investment will be supported by urban traffic control, our work under the network management duty, parking strategy, travel promotion and marketing, as well as our work with the District Councils on land use development. The key actions of our partners include improving bus operation and patronage, increasing travel by train, and the adoption of more school and workplace travel plans.

Figure 12.1
URBAN CENTRAL LEICESTERSHIRE ROAD NETWORK
(change to surveyed routes only)

12.24 The main risk is that traffic growth exceeds our expectations despite all the capital investment and best efforts to encourage alternative means of travel. With the City Council we will manage this risk through regular reviews of our progress with the joint congestion and accessibility strategies. Much of this progress will be reflected in our progress towards the intermediate outcomes for tackling congestion, and for each of these our risk management is set out under the headings which follow in this chapter.

Key outcome – vehicle delays in Loughborough

12.25 Our second key outcome indicator is for the Loughborough area, where congestion is a particular problem. The target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	Time lost per vehicle km 07:00-10:00 in Loughborough	34 secs/v.km 2003	43 secs/v.km 2010

12.26 DfT vehicle travel time data have been used in calculating the indicator for the road network shown in Figure 12.2, which includes all the roads for which full DfT data has been supplied. We have predicted vehicle travel time changes using the Loughborough transport model, which has also been completely renewed for this LTP. This shows a worsening of congestion from 2003 to 2010 of 10 seconds per vehicle kilometre, averaged over the 07:00 to 10:00 morning peak period. We have set the provisional target at a 10% lesser increase of 9 seconds per vehicle kilometre. This, whilst being realistic, will be challenging for the success of our LTP proposals, particularly our efforts to increase bus travel and cycling. Loughborough has a restricted road network and is economically buoyant with substantial extra development due for completion during the LTP2 period, further underlining the challenge of meeting this target.

12.27 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
34 secs	35.2 secs	36.5 secs	37.8 secs	39.1 secs	40.4 secs	41.7 secs	43 secs

12.28 Monitoring will be done annually by analysing the DfT data from ITIS.

12.29 Our key actions for achieving the target include all our proposals for tackling congestion, together with the increased bus patronage from our improvements in access to facilities. In our LTP2 capital programme, this includes the Loughborough cycle route network, routes to school, better vehicle use of road space and bus improvements. This investment will be supported by revenue expenditure on urban traffic control, our work under the network management duty, parking strategy, travel promotion and marketing, as well as our work with the District Councils on land use development. The key actions of our partners include improving bus operation and patronage, increasing travel by train, and the adoption of more school and workplace travel plans.

12.30 The main risk is that the demand for car travel in Loughborough will exceed our expectations despite the capital investment and our best efforts to encourage alternative means of travel. We will best manage this risk by vigorous promotion of travel options by ourselves and our partners. Much of this effort will be reflected in our progress towards the targets for our intermediate outcome indicators for tackling congestion, and our risk management approach is set out under each of these performance indicators.

Figure 12.2
LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD NETWORK

Intermediate outcome – bus passenger journeys

12.31 Better local bus services are essential for tackling congestion and form a major part of the bus strategy (see Appendix G). We propose six intermediate outcome indicators and targets for bus performance, of which five are mandatory. The first of these is for bus passenger journeys as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV102)	Bus passenger journeys (boardings) per year	14.918m 2003/04	15.759m 2010/11

12.32 The target has been set for an annual increase of 1%, which is a continuation of the annual growth target in LTP1. The national target from 2000 to 2010 is for a 12% increase in bus and light rail use, equivalent to 1.2% growth each year. Because there is no light rail in Leicestershire, we believe the 1% annual target is consistent with the national target. Given that bus use is actually declining elsewhere in the country, the target is challenging and will particularly depend on the success of the commercial bus routes into Leicester and Loughborough. However, given our achievements in recent years with quality bus projects, our hourly bus services network, the comprehensive improvements proposed in Central Leicestershire and other measures in our bus strategy, we believe that the target is realistic.

12.33 The comparison of 36 counties during LTP1 shows median growth of 0.2% compared with 1.0% in Leicestershire, with 14 counties experiencing a decline. When patronage levels are compared for 2004/05 with respect to population, Leicestershire had the sixth highest level of the 36 counties. Of the 31 counties with provisional LTP2 targets, the median value is 1.3% per annum growth compared with 1.0% per annum in Leicestershire. However, six counties set provisional targets above 4% per annum growth which may reflect aspiration rather than realism.

12.34 The trajectory has been set as a continuation of the trajectory in LTP1, for which the 2004/05 figure was 14.994m passenger journeys. It allows, however, for the lack of growth in 2005/06 (see below) but assumes continued 1% annual growth throughout the LTP period as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
14.918m	14.994m	14.994m	15.144m	15.295m	15.448m	15.603m	15.759m

12.35 With regard to the baseline, the 2003/04 outcome of 14.918m was 0.072m above the previous trajectory value of 14.846m. In 2004/05 the outcome of 14.992m matched the previous trajectory value of 14.994m. However during 2005/06, our quarterly monitoring has shown no growth on the previous year (due we believe to the significant increases in fares), and we will not meet our LTP1 target of 15.144m passenger journeys in 2005/06. Our trajectory therefore shows this previous target slipping by one year, with 1% annual growth thereafter throughout the LTP2 period.

12.36 Our key actions, together with the City Council, involve major investments in bus infrastructure together with implementation of the Bus Strategy, nearly all of which will contribute to increasing patronage. In our LTP2 capital programme, major investment is proposed in the Leicester park and ride, Leicester bus corridors, with bus improvements for access to facilities throughout the County. The investment will be supported by our major revenue expenditure on contract bus services and concessionary travel, together with our extensive marketing activities. The key actions of our partners, the bus operating companies, include investment in new buses, with improved punctuality, ticketing and passenger care.

12.37 The main risks are the timely delivery of our capital programme schemes, and the step change in bus service quality required from the bus operators. For our capital programme proposals, we will manage the risk by anticipating and minimising any potentially controversial aspects of schemes. The risks associated with improving bus service quality will be managed by open scrutiny through the quality bus partnerships, with particular attention to the individual bus performance indicators described below.

Intermediate outcome – satisfaction with bus services

12.38 The indicator for satisfaction with bus services is different from that used in the first LTP as it tests the opinions of all residents, and not just bus users. The proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV104)	% of all residents satisfied with bus services	58% 2003/04	64% (2009/10)

12.39 The target has been set for a 6% increase by 2009/10, a year before the end of LTP2, but the last year in the LTP2 period when BVPI triennial surveys take place. The 2003/04 satisfaction level of 58% had improved from the level of 55% recorded for 2000/01 when the first of the triennial surveys took place. The target is for this rate of improvement to be continued during each of the successive three year periods up to the target year of 2009/10. Amongst our Best Value comparator group of 13 similar counties, our baseline figure of 58% is in the top quartile. In the 36 county comparison, provisional LTP2 targets were set by 27 counties with a median value of an 8% improvement over six years, compared with 6% in Leicestershire. Because we already have a top quartile level of satisfaction, we consider our target to be stretching, but realistic given our LTP2 proposals.

12.40 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
58%	-	-	61%	-	-	64%	-

12.41 The indicator is not used for mandatory reporting for the years between the BVPI triennial surveys, but we will monitor progress using additional opinion surveys. More frequent monitoring is considered essential to gauge our progress with implementation of the bus strategy, and for keeping the target under regular review. The data collection for this indicator is defined by the Audit Commission requirements for the BVPI triennial surveys, and will be replicated by our additional opinion surveys. Apart from overall satisfaction, the standard questions cover individual levels of satisfaction with service frequency, bus stops, punctuality and ease of getting on and off buses. This additional information will make a significant contribution to monitoring our progress with the Bus Strategy.

12.42 As with our target for bus passenger journeys, our key actions involve major investments in bus infrastructure together with implementation of the Bus Strategy, including our major revenue expenditure and extensive marketing activities. The key actions of our partners, the bus operating companies, include investment in new buses, with improved punctuality, ticketing and passenger care.

12.43 The risks to achieving the target, and our management of those risks, will be essentially the same as has been described for our target for bus passenger journeys. However, the breakdown of information from the surveys, giving satisfaction with individual aspects of bus services, will enable us to focus the effort on particular service attributes in conjunction with the bus operating companies through the quality bus partnerships.

Intermediate outcome – satisfaction with public transport information

12.44 The indicator for satisfaction with public transport information is also different from that used in LTP1, as it tests the opinions of all residents, and not just users of the information. The proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional (BV103)	% of all residents satisfied with public transport information	48% 2003/04	54% (2009/10)

12.45 The target has been set for a 6% improvement, in common with the target for satisfaction with bus services. The 2003/04 satisfaction level of 48% put Leicestershire in the upper quartile of comparable counties, and had improved from the level of 47% recorded for 2000/01. Our rationale for the 6% improvement is that our bus strategy proposals for improving information should increase satisfaction at least in line with overall satisfaction with bus services. Amongst our Best Value comparator group of 13 similar counties, our baseline figure is above the median figure of 46%. There is no 36 county comparative data for this optional indicator.

12.46 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
48%	-	-	51%	-	-	54%	-

12.47 For the years between the BVPI triennial surveys, the indicator is not used for mandatory reporting, but we will again monitor progress, using additional opinion surveys as described for monitoring satisfaction with bus services.

12.48 Our key action, together with the City Council, is to implement our bus information strategy which is a key part of our Bus Strategy. This includes maintenance of the bus services database, telephone and on-line enquiry services, printed information, and bus stop displays for contract services, and real time star-trak and star text information. Our capital programme schemes for Leicester bus corridors and bus improvements will include high quality bus information for the routes involved. The key actions of our partners, the bus operating companies, include in-vehicle information, bus stop displays for commercial services, with driver training and the equipment on buses for expanding real-time information.

12.49 The main risk to achieving the target is that our information improvements do not adequately translate into improved public satisfaction as quantified by opinion surveys of all residents. We will manage this risk through our methods of disseminating information, and our overall approach to travel marketing. This could include further information to individual households in addition to our six monthly door to door delivery of service guides in the main urban areas.

Intermediate outcome – bus punctuality at the start of bus routes

12.50 The mandatory indicators for bus punctuality are a new way of gauging bus performance in Leicestershire, and the scope of the information and surveys required was outlined in the June 2005 Government initial guidance. This involves collecting punctuality data for:

- The start of bus routes
- Intermediate timing points
- Other bus stops between timing points.

12.51 Each of these is required as a separate indicator. At the time of completing LTP2, further guidance was expected regarding survey arrangements and target setting for each of the three indicators. For very frequent bus services, there is a fourth mandatory indicator relating to excess waiting times. However, all the bus services in Leicestershire operate to set timetables and therefore this further indicator is not currently required.

12.52 The first of the three punctuality indicators is described under this heading, and the other two indicators under the next two headings which follow below. For punctuality at the start of bus routes the proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp5)	% of buses between 1 min early and 5 mins late departing at the start of bus routes	90% 2005/06	95% 2010/11

12.53 Our first full surveys of bus punctuality are taking place during 2006 and will be supplemented using data from the star trak real time monitoring system for the same period. The use of star trak data is subject to a data sharing legal agreement due to be finalised with the bus operators in spring 2006. However, through our well developed partnerships, we have been able to obtain confidential data from the two main bus operators for 2005/06. Whilst this indicates punctuality above 90%, we do not have data for the other operators, and our provisional baseline of 90% has been set on a conservative basis.

12.54 The target has been set taking into account the national 90% punctuality target required by 2014/15 at the latest. It is understood that this will be taken as the average of this indicator and the indicator for intermediate timing points described under the next heading below, for which the target is 85%. With the above target of 95%, the average of the two targets amounts to the 90% national target level in 2010/11. Whilst the two main operators currently achieve over 90%, we consider the 95% target to be stretching with all operators included. However, it is considered realistic, given the scope for managing departure consistency at the start of routes.

12.55 The comparison of 36 counties shows provisional LTP2 targets for 17 counties with a median value of 90% by 2010/11, which has been taken to apply to combined punctuality at the start of bus routes and at intermediate timing points. This is therefore comparable with the above 90% combination target for Leicestershire.

12.56 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
n/a	n/a	90%	91%	92%	93%	94%	95%

12.57 The position will be firmly established for 2006/07 from the 2006 survey results and star trak information. Annual monitoring will be based on repeating the surveys and collecting the star trak information each year.

12.58 Our key action, together with the City Council, is to work with bus operating companies in progressing a Punctuality Improvement Plan. The key actions of partners, the bus operating companies, are to implement the specific measures identified in the plan for the start of any routes where action is needed. Our key actions outlined below to improve bus punctuality at intermediate timing points will also help achieve this target.

12.59 The main risk to achieving the target is that insufficient day to day consistency is achieved at the start of every route. Management of the risk will depend on the closeness of supervision by the bus operating companies at any locations where their own monitoring indicates a need for specific action.

Intermediate outcome – bus punctuality at intermediate timing points

12.60 This is the second of the three indicators for bus punctuality, and the proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp5)	% of buses between 1 min early and 5 mins late departing at intermediate timing points	75% 2005/06	85% 2010/11

12.61 Our first full surveys of bus punctuality are taking place during 2006 and will be supplemented using data from the star trak real time monitoring system for the same period. The use of star trak data is subject to a data sharing legal agreement due to be finalised with the bus operators in spring 2006. However, from an initial sample of star trak information in the County, we have set a provisional baseline of 75%. The target has been set to achieve the national target level in 2010/11, when combined with our target under the previous heading for punctuality at the start of bus routes. The average of the 85% and 95% amounts to the 90% national target level in 2010/11. We consider the 85% target to be stretching but also realistic given the level of investment and other actions proposed. Our comparative position with regard to Provisional LTP2 targets is described under the above heading of punctuality at the start of bus routes.

12.62 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
n/a	n/a	75%	77%	79%	81%	83%	85%

12.63 From the 2006 survey results and star trak information, the position will be firmly established for 2006/07. Annual monitoring will be based on repeating the surveys and collecting the star trak information each year.

12.64 Our key actions, together with the City Council, involve major investments in the Leicester bus corridors and small scale bus priorities to help buses through congested traffic, as well as actions under our network management duty to minimise delays to buses. The key actions of our partners, the bus operating companies, are to work with us in progressing a Punctuality Improvement Plan with specific measures to tackle identified problems. Once tested in Central Leicestershire, we intend to extend the approach to the Loughborough and Hinckley QBPs.

12.65 The main risk to achieving the target is that the combined impact of all the actions is not sufficient to bring about the necessary degree of improvement. We will manage this risk through our monitoring of punctuality, work through the quality bus partnerships, and joint implementation of the Punctuality Improvement Plan. Essential parts of such plans are the arrangements for specific joint working on sections of route subject to frequent delay, and for reaching consensus on actions to be taken.

Intermediate outcome – bus punctuality at bus stops between timing points

12.66 This is the third of the three indicators for bus punctuality, and is proposed as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp5)	% of buses between 1 min early and 5 mins late departing at bus stops between timing points	surveys 2006/07	to be set 2010/11

12.67 Our first full surveys of bus punctuality are taking place during 2006 and will be supplemented using data from the star trak system for the same period. The use of star trak data is subject to a data sharing legal agreement due to be finalised with the bus operators in spring 2006.

12.68 We have no current indications of punctuality on which to set a provisional baseline for this indicator. However, many of our timing points are less than 5 minutes apart, and we expect punctuality between timing points to be not very different from that achieved at timing points. When the position is firmly established for 2006/07, we will set a target and trajectory for continuous improvement. The key actions and management of risk will be the same as those previously described for our target for punctuality at intermediate timing points.

Intermediate outcome – school travel

12.69 The 10 school travel indicators are based on show-of-hands surveys in every school each year. The returns from these surveys are due to be collected nationally by the Department for Education and Skills, but the first results for 2006/07 will not be available until 2007.

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp4)	% of journeys to school by car as only pupil	- 2006/07	- 2010/11

12.70 For this school travel indicator, the starting point is the DfT requirement of no increase in the proportion of pupils taken to school by car as the only pupil. Current proportions are in the order of 50% to primary schools and 20% to secondary schools. From DfT research into 120 schools in England introducing school travel plans, there is the potential to reduce these proportions by a factor of between 0.92 and 0.85, based on high levels of intervention with these early examples of school travel planning.

12.71 In addition to the above indicator, which will be required to have a target, the nationally collected information is expected to include indicators for:

- % of journeys to school by sharing with another pupil
- % of journeys to school by any public transport
- % of journeys to school by walking
- % of journeys to school by cycling.

Intermediate outcome – level of cycling

12.72 Our indicator for cycling will build on the monitoring established during the first LTP period. We count levels of cycling continuously at 24 locations in the County, mostly in urban Central Leicestershire and Loughborough, and further monitoring locations are being introduced. The proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp3)	Levels of cycling at representative counting points	Index 100 2000-03 avg	108 2010

12.73 During LTP1, the level of cycling has remained static, with small fluctuations over the four years up to 2003. To eliminate the effect of the fluctuations we have taken the baseline as the 2000 to 2003 four year average. Our target has been set to increase levels of cycling by 8% from 2003 to 2010, averaging out at just over 1% annual growth. Given the background of no growth, this must be considered an ambitious target. Nevertheless, with the level of investment we propose, and the linked work in cycle promotion, we believe it is realistically achievable.

12.74 The comparison of 36 counties during LTP1 shows median growth of 1.5% per annum compared with virtually no growth in Leicestershire, but with 12 counties showing a decline. Of the 27 counties with Provisional LTP2 targets, the median value is 1.6% per annum compared with 1.1% per annum in Leicestershire. However, in four of the counties, provisional targets were set at 8%, 10%, 20% and 25% per annum, although the highest two targets were for counties which showed a decline during LTP1. This suggests a degree of aspiration in provisional LTP2s, and we have aimed for realism, particularly during the early years of LTP2.

12.75 The trajectory has been set on a non-linear basis to reflect the current static position and the expectation that the majority of the growth will occur later in the plan period when most of our investment has taken place and our increased promotion of cycling has taken effect. During the later years we will need to increase cycling levels by 2% a year, which is above the 1.6% per annum median value shown above.

2000-03	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
100	100	100	100	101	102	105	108

12.76 The baseline index of 100 corresponds to the 2000 to 2003 average of 14,153 cycle trips per week counted at the 21 locations used for the core indicator for LTP1. By changing to an index trajectory, it will be possible to include all 24 current continuous count sites and the further locations being introduced. These additional sites include eight locations on the carriageway where manual counts take place every two months, and full results will be available for 2005/06.

12.77 Our key actions involve delivery of cycling infrastructure, and work together with the City Council on the promotion of cycling. Our LTP2 capital programme includes substantial investment in the networks of cycle routes in urban Central Leicestershire and Loughborough. We also expect to add further sections of route working in partnership with Sustrans, and in association with land use development. In the promotion of cycling our partners include the districts, schools and workplaces, as well as the cycling organisations which lobby for better facilities, and can use their best endeavours to help achieve more use of the improving infrastructure.

12.78 The main risk to achieving the target is that people are not motivated to cycle more despite all the efforts being made. We will manage this risk through the extent of our marketing effort and resources, our close attention to monitoring cycling levels, and by increasing marketing activity if necessary.

Contributory output – school travel plans

12.79 We have set two contributory output indicators and targets for the introduction of travel plans. Both are a continuation of equivalent output indicators in LTP1, and are included as a further measure of our progress in influencing travel patterns, particularly in the peak congested periods. The first of these targets is for **school travel plans** as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	% of schools with adopted school travel plans	12% 2003/04	90% 2010/11

12.80 The Government initiative and direct funding to local authorities is to encourage all schools to have a travel plan in place by 2010. Whilst we will use our best efforts to secure this outcome, we recognise that a minority of schools will be unable to dedicate the necessary resources to this work, as they tackle their own challenging agendas. In addition, the target includes private schools, over which we have less influence than with state schools.

12.81 This issue has been raised through our engagement with DfT, and we have agreed that it would be more aspirational than realistic to set a target of 100%

12.82 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
12%	24%	36%	48%	59%	70%	80%	90%

12.83 The trajectory will require about 35 schools to introduce travel plans during each year of the LTP2 period. Whilst this is in line with recent progress it will be challenging to maintain this progress throughout the full LTP2 period as schools which were initially reluctant are brought into the programme. Monitoring of the indicator will be from our records of school travel plan co-ordination.

12.84 Our key actions will be for our four school travel plan staff to work with the schools to encourage and support them in the development of plans, and to further encourage them to do so by focussing our capital investment for safer routes to school on those schools with, or developing, travel plans.

12.85 The main risk is that a minority of schools will be unable to devote the resources needed to achieve plan adoption in the necessary timescale. We will manage this risk by anticipating those schools likely to have difficulties with school travel plans, and giving extra assistance where necessary. There is an additional risk that DfT will reduce its current level of financial support. We will minimise this risk by ensuring that DfT see real returns in terms of outcomes at the school gate.

12.86 Once the majority of schools have their plans in place, we expect that remaining schools will have few misgivings about the process and will make satisfactory progress. However, there will be some exceptions to this, and a major effort may be needed to reach the last few percent of the target.

Contributory output – workplace travel plans

12.87 The second contributory output indicator is for **workplace travel plans**, for which our target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	% of major employers (>250) with workplace travel plans	17% 2003/04	50% 2010/11

12.88 Our continuing co-ordination and promotion of workplace travel plans is focussed particularly, but not exclusively, on major workplaces with 250 or more employees. This is because they generally cause the most congestion, and also have the management resources needed to produce and implement an effective travel plan. Because the most supportive employers already have travel plans, we have based the target on a slightly lower annual addition rate than that achieved so far during the first LTP. Reaching this target will be a significant challenge, but in a recent internal restructuring we have made available extra management support for our work on workplace travel plans, as well as placing increased emphasis on securing travel plans through the development control process. We therefore believe that the target is realistically within reach.

12.89 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
17%	21%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%

12.90 The trajectory will require five major workplaces to introduce travel plans during each year of the LTP2 period. Monitoring of the indicator will be from our records of workplace travel plan co-ordination.

12.91 Our key actions include promotional activity and advice to our partners, the District Councils, where planning applications are involved. We have a full-time co-ordinator for workplace travel plans, and a good record for assisting the adoption of plans at a wide variety of major workplaces. The key actions of our partners, the major employers, will be to work with our co-ordinator to introduce further workplace travel plans, following the processes now well established in Leicestershire. Some of these new plans will be introduced with planning permissions, and the District Councils, will have a key role as local planning authorities.

12.92 The main risks are that insufficient numbers of major employers are convinced of the benefits of putting their resources into workplace travel plans, and the number of planning permissions requiring travel plans diminishes. We will manage these risks through the extent of our co-ordination work, our close working relationship with the District Councils, and additional promotional activity.

Access to facilities

12.93 The LTP objective is:

Improving access to facilities including employment, education, health care, and food shopping, particularly where the analysis shows the greatest levels of social exclusion.

12.94 In Chapter 5 we explained our strategy for achieving this objective, and identified the indicators we will use to quantify and monitor our performance. These are:

- Households within 30 minutes of a main centre
- Households within 60 minutes of a main centre
- Public transport for disabled people
- Bus stops to designated LTP standards
- Low floor buses for level access.

12.95 Each of these is described under the headings which follow. Because we have very nearly achieved our target of 100%, we have not included our Best Value indicator (BV165) for the percentage of pedestrians with facilities for disabled people.

Key outcome – households within 30 minutes of a main centre

12.96 For our mandatory indicator and target, we have focussed on travel times to centres with a range of essential facilities from households without access to a car. Through the work with our partners, we have agreed a definition of a main centre as one providing the following minimum facilities:

- Further education at a college or sixth form
- A large food store or choice of shops selling healthy, competitively priced food
- A post office, bank branch, building society and chemist.

12.97 We have mapped the 30 and 60 minute access time contours and calculated the above baseline figures using the DfT Accession computer program, after checking data supplied by the DfT and making corrections to reflect the current position. The main centres include not only those in Leicestershire and Leicester but also those in adjacent counties on which Leicestershire people depend, and these are detailed in Chapter 5. The proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp1)	Countywide % of households without access to a car within 30 mins of a main centre	89.7% 2004/05	>90% 2010/11

12.98 In completing our hourly bus network in October 2004, we achieved our target of 95% of people in Leicestershire having access to at least an hourly bus service. We believe this to be one of the highest levels of bus access in the country. The extent of our achievement is reflected in the above baseline figure, and keeping this very high level of access will be a significant challenge during the LTP2 period. Our target is set to maintain what we have achieved. This will be particularly challenging knowing that ever-present cost pressures on supported bus services and the reduction in commercially run buses mean we will have to secure considerable increases of patronage to be able to continue to afford the same network. We are confident, however, that our recent progress in increasing patronage on the supported bus network will lay the basis for the future and that the target is therefore realistic.

12.99 The trajectory has been set to maintain access levels as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
n/a	89.7%	89.8%	89.9%	>90%	>90%	>90%	>90%

12.100 Annual monitoring will take place through the running of the DfT Accession computer program using annually updated information regarding the bus network and services.

12.101 Our key action for achieving the target is to secure the network of hourly bus services through increasing the patronage of these services, through a wide range of marketing activities, and thereby reducing dependence on revenue support. The key actions of our partners, the bus operating companies, are to work with us on improving operating standards and customer care. Our current programme of service inspections is proving successful in securing good service standards, and gives us confidence in the joint work to maintain the countywide public transport network.

12.102 The main risk is that bus patronage and operating costs will require increasing levels of revenue support which we are unable to afford. We will manage this risk as best we can through the resources we allocate, and through all our other measures which seek to increase bus patronage. Ultimately we may not be able to avoid marginal reductions in the network of services, but at present we are confident that our target will be achieved, and that the risk is low and manageable.

Key outcome – households within 60 minutes of a main centre

12.103 This is a second indicator to go with the indicator described above and is derived from the same mapping work. The indicator for the 60 minute access time is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp1)	Countywide % of households without access to a car within 60 mins of a main centre	95.8% 2004/05	>96% 2010/11

12.104 This indicator reflects the extent of our hourly bus network in the more rural parts of the County, and the target has again been set to maintain current levels of access.

12.105 The trajectory has been set for access levels as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
n/a	95.8%	95.9%	>96%	>96%	>96%	>96%	>96%

12.106 Annual monitoring, key actions and risk management will be as previously described for the similar indicator for access within 30 minutes.

Intermediate outcome – public transport for disabled people

12.107 Our accessibility strategy also includes ongoing work to improve general access to facilities, most of which is associated with public transport. A key part of this work is our provision of complementary transport for disabled people. Our indicator for the uptake of these services is continued from LTP1 as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	Journeys per week using complementary transport for disabled people	1573 2003/04	1800 2010/11

12.108 Our target is set at just over 14% above baseline, equivalent to 2% annual growth, Whilst we have had excellent recent results, further growth depends on securing increased efficiency through our local car schemes, including the recruitment of more volunteer drivers, and is therefore challenging. Our working relationship with the voluntary providers is however close and effective, and we are confident that further growth is realistic.

12.109 The trajectory has been set as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
1573	1650	1700	1720	1740	1760	1780	1800

12.110 The trajectory to 2005/06 will deliver the LTP1 target of 1700. This will have achieved a substantial increase from the LTP1 base of under 1500 in 2002/03. Therefore our trajectory is to build progressively on this success with a linear trajectory to 2010/11. The data for monitoring this indicator is collected from the monthly returns provided by each of the many transport providers.

12.111 Our key action for achieving the target is to consolidate and develop our working arrangements with the many voluntary providers of these services. The key action of our partners is to work with us on improving the efficiency of the service and making it increasingly attractive to disabled people.

12.112 The main risk is that we are unable to keep up the numbers of volunteer drivers on whom the service depends. Recent experience of expansion of the service indicates that this risk is significant, and we may have to repeat the large-scale recruitment campaign for volunteer drivers that we carried out two years ago. Such a campaign, however, should be capable of sustaining the necessary number of volunteers.

Contributory output – bus stops to designated LTP standards

12.113 We have included two contributory output indicators and targets to further measure progress towards improving general access to facilities. The first is for the upgrading of bus stops with the proposed target as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	% of bus stops provided to designated LTP standards on the hourly network	23% 2003/04	50% 2010/11

12.114 The baseline of 23% is derived from our bus stop database, and using the bus stop standards defined in our bus strategy. We have nearly 4,300 bus stops, and our target of 50 % is based on what we consider to be achievable in terms both of funding and of our staff resources needed to identify what is needed at each location, carry out the significant consultation and carry out the works.

12.115 The trajectory has been set on a mainly linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
23%	23%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%

12.116 Following the current programme for bus stop improvements in 2005/06, the main progress in the trajectory starts with the first year of LTP2 in 2006/07 and is linear thereafter up to the target year. Monitoring of the indicator will be from our records of completed schemes in our capital programme.

12.117 Our key action to achieving the target is to implement our LTP2 capital programme of bus stop improvements, and we have well established arrangements for doing this. On this basis, there is considered to be little risk of not meeting the target.

Contributory output – low floor buses for level access

12.118 Our second contributory output indicator for low floor buses is a continuation of the well established indicator from LTP1, for which our target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	% of bus fleet with low floors for level access based on County and City combined fleet	36% 2003/04	70% 2010/11

12.119 The target will require acceleration in the rate of renewal of the vehicle fleet to 5% per annum. A similar joint target for Central Leicestershire is included in the Central Leicestershire LTP2. We can influence renewal directly through our contract specifications for supported local bus services. For the majority of commercially run services, we work through the Quality Bus Partnerships to influence the provision of new buses as part of our joint investment programmes. The fact that most investment in new buses is outside our direct control makes this target challenging, but our good progress to date, coupled with the increasing pressure of legislative deadlines for all buses to be low-floor, makes it still realistic.

12.120 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
36%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%

12.121 Monitoring will continue to take place annually using the bus fleet information provided each year by the main operators who account for 90% of the vehicle fleet in the County and City.

12.122 The key action for ourselves and Leicester City Council is to work through the Quality Bus Partnerships to influence the provision of new buses as part of our joint investment programmes. We can also influence vehicle provision through our contract specifications for supported local bus services. The key action of our partners, the bus operators, is to maintain the renewal of their vehicle fleets.

12.123 The main risk is that market conditions and financial circumstances for bus operators could lead to a reduction in the rate of vehicle renewal. However, newer vehicles have a major influence on patronage and revenue to bus operators, and therefore the risk to achieving the target is considered to be low.

Reducing road casualties

12.124 The LTP objective is:

Reducing road casualties through local safety schemes and speed management activities as well as continuing road safety education, training and publicity campaigns.

12.125 In Chapter 6 we explained our strategy for achieving this objective, and identified the indicators we will use to quantify and monitor our performance. These are:

- People killed or seriously injured on all roads
- Children killed or seriously injured on all roads
- Motorcyclists killed or seriously injured
- People incurring slight injuries on all roads
- People killed or seriously injured on County roads
- Children killed or seriously injured on County roads
- People incurring slight injuries on County roads.

12.126 Each of these is described under the headings, which follow.

Key outcome – people killed or seriously injured on all roads

12.127 There are three mandatory indicators and targets for reducing road casualties. The first is for all people killed or seriously injured on all roads in the County. This differs from the equivalent indicator and target in LTP1 by being countywide, and not just for the LTP1 area outside Central Leicestershire. The indicator is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV99 x)	People killed or seriously injured on all roads (includes motorways and trunk roads)	339 2001-04 avg	251 2008-10 avg

12.128 The baseline is the four years 2001-04 when the average was 339. However, our target setting also needs to relate to the original DfT reference period, which is the five years from 1994-1998, when the average was 410. Our new 2001-04 baseline figure of 339 is 17% below 410, and represents good progress towards the national target of a 40% reduction by 2010. Our new target amounts to a 42% reduction to 237 in 2010, and is set to achieve a 30% reduction from new the baseline of 339 for 2001-2004. The basis for setting this stretching but realistic target is explained in Chapter 11 under the heading 'Deciding the relative spend between measures', with further background given in Chapter 6.

12.129 The comparison of 36 counties during LTP1 shows for 2004 a median reduction from the 1994-98 average of 25%, which compares with the 27% reduction in Leicestershire in 2004. Amongst our Best Value comparator group of 13 counties, our KSI casualty rate per 100,000 population is the second lowest. Of the 28 counties with provisional LTP2 targets, the median value for 2010 is a 41.1% reduction from the 1994-98 average, compared with the 42% in Leicestershire.

12.130 Experience with the indicator has shown uneven reductions from year to year because of the relatively small numbers involved. We have therefore recalculated our figures to be based on a three year rolling average.

12.131 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

Baseline	2001-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
01-04 avg	339	324	309	294	279	265	251

12.132 Our 30% target reduction to 237 would require a reduction of between 14 and 15 per year, taking the new 2001-04 baseline of 339 as effectively the position in 2003. Working back from 237 at a reduction of 14 per year, our target for 2008-2010 is the average of 265, 251 & 237 and amounts to 251. The intervening trajectory values are calculated on a similar basis from individual year values, with reductions of 15 per year in the first four years and 14 per year in the following three years to 2010. The data for monitoring this indicator is obtained directly from police accident records passed to the County Council for inclusion in our comprehensive database.

12.133 Our key actions for achieving the target are to implement all the actions in our road safety strategy involving education, engineering and enforcement and training. The key actions of our partners include the Highways Agency with their casualty reduction programmes and initiatives, and the police with enforcement including our partnership work on the safety camera scheme. There is also much work by schools and other institutions through our road safety education and training activities.

12.134 The main risk is that factors outside our control negate all the best endeavours of ourselves and our partners, and render them insufficient to achieve the challenging target we have set. In such circumstances our comprehensive monitoring arrangements would already have identified which casualties were not falling at the required rate and we would look to refocus our efforts to tackle those casualties. However, our experience and track record over many years gives us considerable confidence in our approach to casualty reduction, and we consider the risk with regard to meeting the target to be manageable.

Key outcome – children killed or seriously injured on all roads

12.135 The second mandatory indicator is for children killed or seriously injured on all roads in the County. This again differs from the equivalent indicator and target in the first LTP by being countywide, and not just for the first LTP area outside Central Leicestershire. The indicator is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV99 y)	Children killed or seriously injured on all roads (includes motorways and trunk roads)	24 2001-04 avg	16 2008-10 avg

12.136 Our target setting is again related to the DfT five year reference period 1994-98 when the average was 43. The new 2001-04 baseline figure of 24 is 44% below 43, and shows excellent progress towards the national target of a 50% reduction by 2010. Our new target has been set to achieve a 65% reduction to 15 in 2010, and amounts to a 38% reduction from the new baseline of 24 for 2001-2004. This reduction is from a very low base, and we already have one of the lowest child pedestrian casualty rates in the country as highlighted in Chapter 6. Reducing child casualties still further is therefore much more challenging than for the many other authorities starting from a higher base.

12.137 The comparison of 36 counties during LTP1 shows a median reduction from the 1994-98 average of 44% compared with a 58% reduction in Leicestershire to the equivalent three year 2003-05 average of 18. Amongst our Best Value comparator group of 13 counties, our rate per 100,000 population is half the average. Of the 24 counties with provisional LTP2 targets, the median value for 2010 was a 50% reduction from the 1994-98 average, compared with 65% in Leicestershire.

12.138 We have recalculated our figures to be based on a three year rolling average, and the trajectory has been set on a near linear basis as follows:

Baseline	2001-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
01-04 avg	24	22	20	19	18	17	16

12.139 Our 38% target reduction to 15 would require a reduction of between 2 and 1 per year, taking the new 2001-04 baseline of 24 as effectively the position in 2003. Working back from 15 at a reduction of 1 per year, our target for 2008-2010 is the average of 17, 16 & 15 and amounts to 16. The intervening trajectory values are calculated on a similar basis from individual year values, with reductions of 2 per year in the first two years and 1 per year in the following five years to 2010. Monitoring of the indicator will be from police accident records as described above.

12.140 Our key actions for achieving the target are to implement all the actions in our road safety strategy, particularly our comprehensive programme of road safety education and training aimed at child safety. The key actions of our partners involve the Highways Agency and the police, as well as the work by schools and other institutions involved in our road safety education and training activities.

12.141 The main risk is again that all our efforts prove insufficient to achieve the target, but from our experience and track record we consider the risk to be manageable.

Key outcome – motorcyclists killed or seriously injured

12.142 Because of the unfavourable national and local trends in recent years, we have included an optional indicator for motorcyclists killed or seriously injured. Our target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	Motorcyclists killed or seriously injured on all roads (includes motorways and trunk roads)	66 2001-04 avg	60 2008-10 avg

12.143 The target is also a three year moving average to deal sensibly with year to year fluctuations. Our 2001-04 baseline figure of 66 is significantly above the 1994-98 five year average of 61, and is in marked contrast with the overall casualty reduction trend as we increased our efforts in this area. However, during the baseline period of 2001-04 there was a downward trend, and we have set our target for this to continue. Whilst our target of 60 is a modest reduction compared with the 2001/04 base of 66, it will be a considerable challenge to achieve the 10% reduction required from this level given national trends and the likely growth in motorcycle use.

12.144 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

Baseline	2001-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
01-04 avg	66	65	64	63	62	61	60

12.145 Monitoring of the indicator will be from police accident records as described above.

12.146 Our key actions include a range of initiatives for motorcycle safety within our road safety strategy. These initiatives are shared with our partners in both the local and regional partnerships and the Leicester and Leicestershire Motorcycle Forum. The risk is that a combination of the growth in motorcycling and our inability to change the behaviour of motorcyclists means that all our efforts prove insufficient to reduce the disproportionate number and severity of motorcycle casualties. Based on the progress made in recent years, we are confident that all the efforts now being made will result in the target being achieved.

Key outcome – people incurring slight injuries on all roads

12.147 The third mandatory indicator is people slightly injured on all roads in the County. This again differs from the equivalent indicator and target in LTP1 by being countywide, and not just for the LTP1 area outside Central Leicestershire. The indicator is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV99 z)	People incurring slight injuries on all roads (includes motorways and trunk roads)	2836 2001-04 avg	2496 2010

12.148 The 2001-04 baseline figure of 2836 is above the 1994-98 five year average of 2773. However, during the baseline period of 2001-04 our LTP1 strategy helped to bring about a downward trend, and we expect this to continue. We have set the target to reduce these casualties by 10% from the 1994-98 average, amounting to a 12% reduction from the 2001-2004 baseline, which exceeds the DfT minimum criterion for a stretching target.

12.149 Slight casualties were not a core indicator during LTP1 and information from the 36 county comparative data on changes during this period is not readily available. Of the 24 counties with provisional LTP2 targets, the median value was a 10% reduction from the 1994-98 average, which is the same as the target proposed for Leicestershire.

12.150 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

Baseline	2001-04	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
01-04 avg	2836	2779	2722	2665	2608	2552	2496

12.151 Monitoring of the indicator will be from police accident records as described above.

12.152 Our key actions and the key actions of our partners are the same as those described above for killed or seriously injured casualties. The risk to achieving the target is also the same and is considered to be manageable given the progress made in recent years.

Intermediate outcome – people killed or seriously injured on County Council roads

12.153 For each of the three mandatory indicators, which are for all roads, including motorways and trunk roads, we have set equivalent intermediate indicators and targets for casualties on County Council roads only, as explained in Chapter 6. In each case the indicators and the 1994-98 figures include the recently de-trunked A6 and A47 routes. The first of these three targets is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	People killed or seriously injured on County roads only (includes de-trunked roads)	272 2001-04 avg	199 2008-10

12.154 The 1994-98 average was 352, and the target has been set on the same basis as our Public Service Agreement target during LTP1 to achieve the national 40% reduction two years early in 2008. Taking the new baseline as effectively the position in 2003, this requires a reduction of 12 per year to 211 in 2008. Continuing at this rate of reduction to 2010 gives a final year target of 187. This amounts to a 31% reduction from the 2001-2004 baseline, and is a 47% reduction from the 1994-98 average.

12.155 As with the equivalent mandatory target for all roads, we have recalculated our individual year figures to be based on a three year rolling average. The trajectory has been set on a linear basis from the new baseline as follows:

Baseline	2001-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
01-04 avg	272	259	247	235	223	211	199

12.156 Working back from 187 at a reduction of 12 per year, our target for 2008-2010 is the average of 211, 199 & 187 and amounts to 199. Taking the new baseline as the position in 2003, the intervening trajectory values are calculated on a similar basis from individual year values, with a reduction of 13 in 2004, and 12 per year in the six years thereafter to 2010.

12.157 Except for joint work with the Highways Agency, the monitoring, key actions and risk management are the same as those previously described for the mandatory target for all roads.

Intermediate outcome – children killed or seriously injured on County roads

12.158 The second intermediate target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	Children killed or seriously injured on County roads only (includes de-trunked roads)	22 2001-04 avg	15 2008-10 avg

12.159 The 1994-98 average was 40, and the target has been set on the same basis and to give the same percentage reduction from 1994-98 as the equivalent mandatory target. The trajectory has been set on a near linear basis from the new baseline as follows:

Baseline	2001-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
01-04 avg	22	20	19	18	17	16	15

12.160 Except for joint work with the Highways Agency, the monitoring, key actions and risk management are the same as those previously described for the mandatory target for all roads.

Intermediate outcome – people incurring slight injuries on County roads

12.161 The third intermediate target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	People incurring slight casualties on County roads only (includes de-trunked roads)	2301 2001-04 avg	2073 2010

12.162 We have set this target to give a 12% reduction from the 1994-98 figure of 2356 to 2073 in 2010. This amounts to a 10% reduction from the new 2001-04 baseline of 2301, and we have set a trajectory as follows:

Baseline	2001-04	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
01-04 avg	2301	2263	2225	2187	2149	2111	2073

12.163 Except for joint work with the Highways Agency, the monitoring, key actions and risk management are the same as those previously described for the mandatory target for all roads.

Improving air quality

12.164 The LTP objective for Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) is:

Improving air quality in the traffic-related AQMAs in each district through action plans and robust monitoring of nitrogen dioxide concentrations against national target levels.

12.165 Our LTP strategy for air quality is set out in Chapter 7 and is focussed on the 12 original traffic-related AQMAs which have been subject to detailed assessment and monitoring, and which are shown in Figure 7.2. Nine are due to local rather than motorway traffic, and in all nine the critical pollutant is the annual average concentrations of nitrogen dioxide. For these local traffic AQMAs the position in 2004 had improved to the extent that only in Loughborough, Lutterworth and Kegworth was the 40 µg/m³ national air quality objective exceeded at residential façades.

12.166 In the other six local traffic AQMAs the residential façade values of nitrogen dioxide in 2004 were well below 40 µg/m³, and four of these AQMAs are expected to be revoked, subject to the completion of monitoring as agreed with Defra. In the remaining two local traffic AQMAs the District Councils will continue to monitor the position, but current evidence suggests that the 40 µg/m³ concentration is unlikely to be exceeded in future. Monitoring at these locations is ongoing.

12.167 There are also three AQMAs declared due to pollution from motorway traffic. These are alongside the M1 motorway but, being associated with roads managed by the Highways Agency, do not require air quality targets to be included in LTP2.

12.168 Air quality action plans are included in Chapter 7 for the AQMAs in Loughborough, Lutterworth and Kegworth, and a full set of targets for NO₂ is included in this chapter. These are based on predicted changes in traffic volumes and air quality modelling using the Design Manual Roads and Bridges. This modelling has been carried out by Air Quality Consultants Ltd, who have assisted us in addressing the air quality work identified by Defra for completion of LTP2. This included the setting of mandatory targets for all local traffic AQMAs, including the six where nitrogen dioxide levels were well below 40 µg/m³ in 2004.

12.169 For the nitrogen dioxide targets we have not specified trajectories for monitoring progress. This is because, even where emissions are decreasing, there are likely to be fluctuations in concentrations from year to year due to varying weather conditions. Instead we have introduced intermediate indicators based on the traffic growth percentages used for the air quality modelling. These intermediate indicators have targets and trajectories which will be used to gauge progress towards meeting the nitrogen dioxide targets indirectly. Our indicators are:

- Nitrogen dioxide – Loughborough High Street
- Traffic growth – Loughborough High Street
- Nitrogen dioxide – Loughborough Derby Road
- Nitrogen dioxide – Lutterworth Regent Court
- Traffic growth – Lutterworth Regent Court
- Nitrogen dioxide – Kegworth village centre
- Traffic growth – Kegworth village centre
- Nitrogen dioxide in six other local road AQMAs
- Total vehicle kilometres countywide.

12.170 These are described under the headings which follow.

Key outcome – nitrogen dioxide – Loughborough High Street

12.171 In Loughborough the annual monitoring of nitrogen dioxide shows that A6 High Street has by far the highest levels in the AQMA. Our mandatory target for the AQMA is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp8)	A6 Loughborough High Street – Nitrogen Dioxide annual average concentration	67.7 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2004	52.2 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2010

12.172 The target has been set by forecasting how the contributions to the current concentration of nitrogen dioxide will change from 2004 to 2010 with the air quality action plan set out in Chapter 7 and changes in traffic volume. Our prediction of traffic growth is described with the intermediate outcome indicator below, and is 1.9% per annum from 2004 to 2010. The mapped background levels of nitrogen dioxide are 21.7 µg/m³ in 2004 falling to 19.1 µg/m³ in 2010. When subtracted from the above baseline, this gives the traffic contribution in 2004 of 46.0 µg/m³. DMRB air quality modelling predicts a 28% reduction in the traffic contribution to 33.6 µg/m³ in 2010. When combined with the 2010 background level of 19.1 µg/m³, the 2010 concentration is predicted to be 52.2 µg/m³.

12.173 We have set our target at the modelled level, although not all the effects of the action plan are reflected in the forecasting process, in particular our action plan work to reduce bus emissions. However, we are advised that setting the target at the forecast level is likely to be particularly stretching. Past monitoring in the UK has not shown the extent of decline in

roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations predicted by modelling. Modelling also does not reflect potential increases in ozone concentrations which can exacerbate nitrogen dioxide concentrations even when emissions from vehicles are declining. For these reasons we have not made any deduction from the modelled concentration in setting our target. In line with Government guidance there is no trajectory for this target.

12.174 Our key action is to implement all our parts of the air quality action plan as set out in Chapter 7. This includes action by our partners the bus operators to work with us to reduce bus emissions. The key action of our partner Charnwood Borough Council is to implement their parts of the action plan and to continue and further develop their monitoring of air quality at this location.

12.175 The main risk, as described above, is that lower emissions from traffic are not matched by the expected reduction in nitrogen dioxide concentrations predicted by air quality modelling. Because of year on year variation in monitoring nitrogen dioxide, however, it may be difficult to identify whether or not this is going to be a problem, although the emerging trends across the country will give some indication.

Intermediate outcome indicator – traffic growth – Loughborough High Street

12.176 The intermediate indicator is based on our forecast of traffic growth on the A6 in Loughborough town centre, as used for the air quality modelling for both our nitrogen dioxide targets. The traffic growth target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp8)	A6 Loughborough town centre – traffic growth index (2004 = 100)	100 2004	111.4 2010

12.177 From the Loughborough traffic model, the predicted annual traffic growth on Loughborough High Street is 1.4% in the AM peak, no growth in the PM peak and 2.00% during the off peak. With each of the peak hours taken as 8% of daily traffic, the annual growth in daily traffic amounts to 1.8%. However, the lack of growth in the PM peak is considered unlikely to be achieved, and we assume that growth in the PM peak will actually be similar to that in the AM peak, giving daily traffic growth of 1.9%. Despite the extent of development expected in Loughborough during LTP2, this is the same as our 1.9% countywide traffic growth target, described at the end of this section. The continuous traffic count site on the A6 nearby has not provided sufficient data to give the traffic growth trend in recent years, and we have taken 1.9% as the basis for air quality modelling and target setting.

12.178 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
n/a	100	101.9	103.8	105.7	107.6	109.5	111.4

12.179 Monitoring will use data from the continuous traffic count site on the A6 on Derby Road close to the town centre.

12.180 Our key actions are to implement all the proposals in the action plan which will have a moderating influence on traffic growth. The main risk to achieving the target is that economic expansion will cause traffic levels to grow ahead of the trajectory. This risk is considered to be low, but there would be little we could do in such circumstances to manage the risk by constraining traffic on this former trunk road.

Key outcome – nitrogen dioxide – Loughborough Derby Road

12.181 The A6 Loughborough Derby Road just north of the town centre is the second worst location in the AQMA. We have set an optional nitrogen dioxide target for this location as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional (as Ltp8)	A6 Loughborough Derby Road – Nitrogen Dioxide annual average concentration	43.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ NO ₂ 2004	<40 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ NO ₂ 2010

12.182 It is expected that this target will be met well before the end of the LTP2 period. This means that the whole AQMA will be below the 2010 limit value, with the single exception of A6 High Street. Our prediction of traffic growth is the same 1.9% per annum as used for A6 High Street, and the same intermediate outcome indicator will be used to gauge progress towards achieving the NO₂ target. The mapped background levels of nitrogen dioxide are 21.6 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in 2004 falling to 19.3 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in 2010. When subtracted from the above baseline, this gives the traffic contribution in 2004 of 22.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. DMRB air quality modelling predicts a 29% reduction in the traffic contribution to 15.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in 2010. When combined with the 2010 background level of 19.3 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, the 2010 concentration is predicted to be 35.0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. This is well below the target of 40 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

12.183 Our key actions are to implement our parts of the air quality action plan. The key actions of our partner Charnwood Borough Council are to implement their parts of the action plan and continue monitoring air quality at this location. The risks to achieving the target are considered to be low, because the reduction required from baseline to target is not great and should be achieved well before the end of the LTP2 period.

Key outcome – nitrogen dioxide – Lutterworth Regent Court

12.184 The A426 Lutterworth at Regents Court has the highest concentration of nitrogen dioxide in the Lutterworth AQMA. Our mandatory target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp8)	A426 Lutterworth Regent Court – Nitrogen Dioxide annual average concentration	57.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ NO ₂ 2004	44.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ NO ₂ 2010

12.185 The target has been set by forecasting how the contributions to the current level of nitrogen dioxide will change from 2004 to 2010 with the air quality action plan set out in Chapter 7 and changes in traffic volume. Our prediction of traffic growth is described with the intermediate outcome indicator for Lutterworth below, and is 2.7% per annum from 2004 to 2010. The mapped background levels of nitrogen dioxide are 20.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in 2004 falling to 16.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in 2010. When subtracted from the above baseline, this gives the traffic contribution in 2004 of 37.6 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. DMRB air quality modelling predicts a 27% reduction in the traffic contribution to 27.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in 2010. When combined with the 2010 background level of 16.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, the 2010 concentration is predicted to be 44.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. As with Loughborough High Street, the presence of other variables is likely to affect adversely the final nitrogen dioxide concentration, and this makes us believe that achieving this target will be stretching.

12.186 Our key action is to implement our parts of the air quality action plan as set out in Chapter 7. The key action of our partner Harborough District Council is to implement their parts of the action plan and to continue and further develop their monitoring of air quality at this location.

12.187 The main risk, as explained above for the main Loughborough target, is that lower emissions from traffic are not matched by the expected reduction in nitrogen dioxide predicted by air quality modelling. Because of year on year fluctuations in nitrogen dioxide concentrations, it may be difficult to identify whether or not this is going to be a problem.

Intermediate outcome indicator – traffic growth – Lutterworth Regent Court

12.188 The intermediate indicator is based on our forecast of traffic growth on A426 in Lutterworth, as used for the air quality modelling. The traffic growth target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp8)	Lutterworth Regent Court – traffic growth index (2006 = 100)	100 2004	116.2 2010

12.189 We have no traffic model for predicting traffic growth in Lutterworth, but our long established continuous traffic count site has recorded 14.4% growth from 2000 to 2005, amounting to 2.9% per annum. We have also looked at national statistics to see how growth on rural A class roads such as the A426 compared with overall traffic growth from 2000 to 2005. When motorway traffic is excluded, this analysis shows that for every 1% of non-motorway traffic growth, there was 1.4% growth on rural A class roads. Within our overall local traffic growth target of 1.9%, we therefore expect growth on rural A class roads to be a factor of 1.4 higher, amounting to 2.7%. Whilst this is less than recent growth on the A426 it has been taken as the basis for air quality modelling and target setting.

12.190 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows:

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
n/a	100.0	102.7	105.4	108.1	110.8	113.5	116.2

12.191 Monitoring will use data from the continuous traffic count site on the A426 at the south end of Lutterworth town centre.

12.192 Our key actions are to implement all the proposals in the action plan which will have a moderating influence on traffic growth. The main risk to achieving the target is that economic expansion will cause traffic levels to grow ahead of the trajectory. This risk is considered to be low, but there would be little we could do in such circumstances to manage the risk by constraining traffic on this important A class road.

Key outcome – nitrogen dioxide – Kegworth village centre

12.193 The A6 in Kegworth village centre in 2004 had concentrations of nitrogen dioxide slightly over the 40 µg/m³ threshold. Our mandatory target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp8)	A6 Kegworth village centre – Nitrogen Dioxide annual average concentration	41.6 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2004	<40 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2010

12.194 The target has been set by forecasting how the contributions to the current level of nitrogen dioxide will change from 2004 to 2010 with the air quality action plan set out in Chapter 7 and changes in traffic volume. Our prediction of traffic growth is described with the intermediate outcome indicator for Kegworth below, and is 2.7% per annum from 2004 to 2010. The mapped background levels of nitrogen dioxide are 26.4 µg/m³ in 2004 falling to 21.3 µg/m³ in 2010. When subtracted from the above baseline, this gives the traffic contribution in 2004 of 15.2 µg/m³. DMRB air quality modelling predicts a 27% reduction in the traffic contribution to 12.9 µg/m³ in 2010. When combined with the 2010 background level of 21.3 µg/m³, the 2010 concentration is predicted to be 34.2 µg/m³. This is well below the target of 40 µg/m³.

12.195 Our key actions are to implement our parts of the air quality action plan. The key actions of our partner North West Leicestershire District Council are to implement their parts of the action plan and continue monitoring air quality at this location. The risks to achieving the target are considered to be low, because the reduction required from baseline to target is marginal and should be achieved during the early years of the LTP2 period.

Intermediate outcome indicator – traffic growth – Kegworth village centre

12.196 The intermediate indicator is based on our forecast of traffic growth on A6 through Kegworth, as used for the air quality modelling. The traffic growth target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp8)	Kegworth A6 village centre – traffic growth index (2006 = 100)	100 2004	116.2 2010

12.197 We have no traffic model for predicting traffic growth in Kegworth, but our long established continuous traffic count site has recorded 13.7% growth from 2000 to 2005, amounting to 2.7% per annum. We have also looked at national statistics to see how growth on rural A class roads such as the A6 compared with overall traffic growth from 2000 to 2005. When motorway traffic is excluded, this analysis shows that for every 1% of non-motorway traffic growth, there was 1.4% growth on rural A class roads. Within our overall local traffic growth target of 1.9%, we therefore expect growth on rural A class roads to be a factor of 1.4 higher, amounting to 2.7%. This matches recent growth on the A6 and has been taken as the basis for air quality modelling and target setting.

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
n/a	100.0	102.7	105.4	108.1	110.8	113.5	116.2

12.198 Monitoring will use data from the continuous traffic count site on the A6 just north of Kegworth village.

12.199 Our key actions are to implement all the proposals in the action plan which will have a moderating influence on traffic growth. The main risk to achieving the target is that economic expansion will cause traffic levels to grow ahead of the trajectory. This risk is considered to be low, but there would be little we could do in such circumstances to manage the risk by constraining traffic on this important A class road.

Key outcomes – nitrogen dioxide in six other local road AQMAs

12.200 In 2004 the three AQMAs in Loughborough, Lutterworth and Kegworth all showed nitrogen dioxide exceeding the 40 µg/m³ limit, and they have nitrogen dioxide reduction targets as previously described. In the six remaining local traffic AQMAs, the 2004 concentrations of nitrogen dioxide were less than 40 µg/m³. As these are currently declared AQMAs, we are required to set LTP targets for 2010, and it has been agreed with Defra that the target be set at <40 µg/m³ in each case as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp8)	<u>Blaby District</u> – Narborough Road South AQMA at Jordans Garage	33.9 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2004	<40 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2010
Mandatory (Ltp8)	<u>Charnwood Borough</u> – Syston AQMA on Melton Road at Barkby Road	30.7 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2004	<40 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2010
Mandatory (Ltp8)	<u>Oadby & Wigston Borough</u> – A6 Oadby AQMA at Victoria Court	34.1 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2004	<40 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2010
Mandatory (Ltp8)	<u>Oadby & Wigston Borough</u> – A5199/B582 AQMA on A5199 Leicester Road	29.7 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2004	<40 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2010
Mandatory (Ltp8)	<u>Oadby & Wigston Borough</u> – Aylestone Lane AQMA at Shackerdale Road	32.7 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2004	<40 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2010
Mandatory (Ltp8)	<u>Oadby & Wigston Borough</u> – Saffron Road AQMA at Tigers Road	30.3 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2004	<40 µg/m ³ NO ₂ 2010

12.201 As in Loughborough, many of our proposals for tackling congestion will have a beneficial effect on air quality. However, no specific actions are needed to meet these targets. As agreed with Defra, no intermediate indicators are required at these locations.

12.202 The risk to achieving the targets is considered to be extremely low. Using DMRB modelling, we have calculated that traffic would have to increase by more than 200% by 2010 for any of these targets not to be met. Such growth would not be physically possible on the roads through these AQMAs. Indeed, we expect that our efforts, together with the effects of other variables, will reduce these figures significantly below their present baseline positions.

Intermediate outcome – total vehicle kilometres countywide

12.203 Our final indicator for air quality is for total traffic on County roads. This is based on DfT annual traffic monitoring and the target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (Ltp2)	Total vehicle kilometres on County roads in calendar year from DfT route details	3672m v.kms 2003	4160m v.kms 2010

12.204 The target is for traffic growth not to exceed 13.3% over the seven year period, based on flat rate growth of 1.9% per annum. This has been set with regard to recent traffic trends and national forecasts for traffic growth. For the five counties in the East Midlands, recent traffic growth from DfT data is shown in Table 12.1. These figures are not strictly comparable with the indicator because they are for total traffic in each county, including trunk roads and motorways. Historic figures for local roads combined with de-trunked roads are not available, and the above baseline figure for Leicestershire in 2003 has been calculated from detailed data supplied by DfT following our request.

Table 12.1 Traffic growth in the East Midlands counties

County (or road combination)	Level of traffic					Annual growth (flat rate)
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	
Derbyshire	100	102.9	104.2	106.8	108.7	2.17%
Leicestershire	100	102.2	105.4	105.8	107.9	1.98%
Lincolnshire	100	101.1	104.8	106.2	108.2	2.05%
Northamptonshire	100	102.2	106.5	110.5	112.3	3.07%
Nottinghamshire	100	101.4	104.2	106.6	109.4	2.35%
Five county average	100	102.0	105.1	107.3	109.4	2.35%
Motorways (national)	100	102.8	104.9	105.2	109.3	2.33%
NRTF97 High growth	100	102.8	104.8	106.9	109.0	2.26%

12.205 The 1.98% traffic growth in Leicestershire is the lowest for the five counties, but the 2003 index of 105.8 shows exceptionally low growth from the 2002 figure of 105.4, and the true position in Leicestershire could have been somewhat above 2%. The effect of including all roads in the above figures has been considered with regard to national statistics for traffic growth on motorways as shown in the table. The 2.33% annual growth on motorways is no higher than the five county average of 2.35% for all roads, and suggests that the above figures may be close to the growth that has occurred and may continue to occur on county roads, excluding trunk roads and motorways.

12.206 Predictions of future traffic growth need to allow for increases in the numbers of vehicle journeys and also journey length. The most recent predictions which include both influences are given by the National Road Traffic Forecast 1997 (NRTF97), and the high growth figures for 2000 to 2004 closely match the outcomes as shown in the table, with recent annual growth of 2.26%. The NRTF97 central growth prediction amounted to 1.74% flat rate over the same period and is therefore less suitable for forecasting in the medium term. For the above target period from 2003 to 2010, NRTF97 high growth predicts a traffic increase of 14.1%, which amounts to 2.0% per annum flat rate growth.

12.207 From all the figures in the table and the comments above, we consider the 2.0% growth derived from NRTF97 to be a reliable forecast for the LTP period, but have set our target at no more than 1.9% flat rate per annum to reflect the influence of the LTP. Whilst the target is for all days in the year including weekends, our LTP proposals are mainly focussed on congested areas at peak times. The majority of traffic is outside urban areas and during times of day when our scope for influencing travel behaviour is diminished. Car journeys to work or school are in the minority when traffic is quantified for every hour in the week, and we have to be realistic in setting the target.

12.208 From the 36 county comparison, 23 counties set provisional LTP2 targets for traffic growth. The median value was 1.6% per annum, compared with the 1.9% per annum target for Leicestershire. However 11 out of the 23 counties set targets at 1.9% per annum or higher, putting Leicestershire into a near middle position.

12.209 We have set the trajectory on a linear basis as follows:

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
3672	3741	3810	3880	3950	4020	4090	4160

12.210 Monitoring will take place each year using the DfT detailed breakdown of national traffic monitoring in Leicestershire, and subtracting all the figures for motorways and trunk roads, as was done for calculating the 2003 baseline.

12.211 Our key actions for achieving the target include all our proposals for tackling congestion, together with better access to facilities. In our LTP capital programme this includes the cycle route networks, routes to school and bus improvements, which will reduce growth in car travel. This investment will be supported by our parking strategy, travel promotion and marketing, as well as our work with the district councils on land use development. The key actions of our partners include improving bus operation and patronage, increasing travel by train, and the adoption of more school and workplace travel plans.

12.212 The main risk is that the demand for car travel will exceed our expectations despite the capital investment and our best efforts to encourage alternative means of travel. We will best manage this risk by vigorous promotion of travel options by ourselves and our partners. Ultimately, however, we have no means available to intervene directly in people's lifestyle and travel choices.

Reducing the impact of traffic

12.213 The LTP objective is:

Reducing the impact of traffic through local communities, near schools and within town centres by reducing vehicle speeds and in exceptional cases re-routing the traffic.

12.214 Reducing the impact of traffic is a major concern for Leicestershire people, whether this is through relatively small speed reduction schemes or the occasional major scheme such as the Earl Shilton Bypass and the Loughborough town centre scheme. The benefits of reducing traffic impact can be perceived in many ways and are not easily measurable. We therefore propose only a single indicator, but one which directly reflects the main outcome of our objective for all but the exceptional schemes. The choice of indicator also reflects our revised approach, with increased emphasis on 'behavioural' measures at many more locations than could previously be considered with the traditional approach using extensive vertical features.

Key outcome – reduction in traffic speed

12.215 Our indicator for speed reduction is based on the before and after speed surveys which are routinely undertaken for each scheme. The proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	Percentage reduction in 85 th percentile speed for all schemes in the year	9.5% 2004/05	12% 2010/11

12.216 It is expected that nearly all our schemes of this type will involve a combination of relatively low cost measures including village entry treatments, special road markings, pedestrian refuges and vehicle activated signs. Our baseline figure is the average for a total of 25 schemes.

12.217 Following the popularity and proven success of these schemes, our programme for reducing the impact of traffic will see their application extended to locations where there is particular community concern, but little or no direct association with casualty reduction. To maximise their effectiveness in reducing speeds we will combine the various measures as described above. Our target reflects our plans for steadily improving the effectiveness and outcome of such schemes during the LTP period.

12.218 The trajectory is set as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	9.5%	9.5%	10%	11%	12%	12%	12%

12.219 Monitoring will be carried out by before and after radar speed surveys of 85th percentile speeds. The result will be a simple arithmetic average of the results for each scheme

12.220 Our key actions are to implement the LTP capital programme schemes in the most cost-effective way to achieve the reductions in speed. The risks to achieving the target are considered to be low, but the results of each scheme will be monitored for its effectiveness and the results will influence the design of future schemes. The process should be self-correcting if some arrangements prove less than successful.

Managing transport assets

12.221 The LTP objective is:

Managing transport assets in the most cost-effective way through robust condition monitoring, timeliness of intervention and economies of scale in repairs and renewal.

12.222 In Chapter 9 we explained our strategy for achieving this objective, and identified the indicators we will use to quantify and monitor our performance. We have nine asset categories, four of which have mandatory indicators. The nine categories include all our main transport assets and deal with the key issues of asset depreciation and renewal, showing the extent to which we are able to meet the aspirational initial target of removing all maintenance backlogs by 2010.

12.223 Achievement of most of the asset management targets will depend to varying degrees on continued revenue investment. Whilst the targets have been set with future pressures on our revenue budget in mind, it is not possible to say at this stage what the impact of those pressures will be for the whole of the LTP2 period. We will manage this risk through our active programme of work to produce continuing efficiencies in both our capital and revenue programmes, and where possible by focussing any required cost savings on operations which do not impact on our targets. The risk analysis in the rest of this section deals with the remaining risks to the targets.

12.224 Our overall aim is for all transport assets to be kept in a steady state and fit for purpose condition at the least possible long-term cost. In order to reach this state it is vital to have indicators of current condition for all nine categories. A number of these have been developed over time, though subject to changing measurement systems, but others have been newly developed for LTP2. Our set of indicators is as follows:

- Principal road condition from SCANNER surveys
- Principal road condition by deflectograph
- Non principal road condition by SCANNER surveys
- Unclassified road condition by visual inspection
- Category 1 & 2 footway condition
- Category 3 & 4 footway condition
- Rights of way signposted and easy to use

- Bridges below critical condition thresholds
- Street lighting columns needing replacement
- Traffic signal installations needing renewal.

12.225 These are described under the headings which follow.

Key outcome – principal road condition from SCANNER surveys

12.226 The SCANNER method was used for the first time in 2004/05 to measure the condition of principal (A class) roads. The proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV223)	% of principal (A class) roads with structural defects (SCANNER)	19.7% 2004/05	17.4% 2010/11

12.227 The 2004/05 baseline indicates a higher defective proportion of roads than the previous results from our deflectograph surveys. This is associated with the specified thresholds for SCANNER defects in surface texture, cracking and rutting. Thresholds for 2005/06 are being revised and the figure for 2004/05 will be recalculated on the same basis, as recommended by the UK Roads Board, to produce, we expect, significantly lower figures. Our analysis suggests that we are close to, but have not yet reached, optimum steady state condition for principal roads. We have therefore set a target of 17.4% for SCANNER, equivalent to the 10% deflectograph target described below. The actual target will of course change when the SCANNER results are recalibrated.

12.228 Amongst our Best Value group of 13 similar counties, our baseline figure is top quartile, with only one county showing a better figure at 15.3%. For LTP2 provisional targets, the 36 county comparison is combined with other authorities and only shows directions of change. Where provisional targets were set, the majority were for an improvement in condition.

12.229 The trajectory has been set on a linear basis as follows, though again the numbers will be revised once we have the recalibrated SCANNER results:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	19.7%	19.3%	18.9%	18.5%	18.1%	17.7%	17.4%

12.230 Monitoring will take place annually following the annual SCANNER surveys and analysis of results, with lower values expected from the revised thresholds.

12.231 Our key action is to improve further the condition of principal roads through our long established programme of inspection and prioritised renewal of carriageways, which will be given an even sharper focus by our work on the TAMP. We have specifically set our allocation of funds to achieve this target and the risk of not meeting it is therefore considered to be low.

Key outcome – principal road condition by deflectograph

12.232 Before the SCANNER survey method was introduced, the condition of principal roads was measured by the deflectograph. We propose to continue this method of survey to run side by side with SCANNER for the whole of the LTP2 period as a calibration check. The target, as noted above, is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional (ex BV96)	% of principal (A class) roads with structural defects (deflectograph)	11.3% 2004/05	10% 2010/11

12.233 Advice from DfT is that a target of 10% to 12% is near optimum for steady state condition. We are already within this range, but believe the importance of these roads requires us to maintain condition at the lower end of the range.

12.234 The trajectory is as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	11.3%	11.0%	10.8%	10.6%	10.4%	10.2%	10%

12.235 Monitoring will take place annually following the annual deflectograph surveys of all principal roads, and the analysis of results.

12.236 Our key actions are those previously described for the SCANNER mandatory indicator for principal roads, and the risk of not meeting the target is similarly low.

Key outcome – non principal road condition by SCANNER surveys

12.237 The condition of non-principal (B + C class) roads is being measured for the first time in 2005/06 using the SCANNER method, and the indicator is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV224a)	% of non-principal (B + C class) roads with structural defects (SCANNER)	- 2005/06	- 2010/11

12.238 The 2005/06 figures were not available at the time of completing LTP2, and it is not required that a target be set in LTP2. When we have obtained the SCANNER information for 2005/06, and examined the figures for individual roads, we will set a target and trajectory for this indicator. These will be related to the CVI survey results for these roads, which show that we are already within the 10% to 12% optimum steady state range. We have set our investment level to maintain this, but will review this in the light of our final TAMP and of the SCANNER figure cross-checked against SCANNER results for principal roads.

Key outcome – unclassified road condition by visual inspection

12.239 Condition surveys for unclassified roads will continue to depend on the current visual inspection method for the time being, and our indicator is continued from LTP1. The target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV224b)	% of unclassified roads with structural defects (visual inspection)(previously BV97b)	9.6% 2004/05	<10% 2010/11

12.240 This indicator has been subject to definition changes during LTP1, and it is expected that the SCANNER or an equivalent survey method will eventually be introduced for measuring carriageway condition. This figure reflects excellent progress and, we believe, takes us close to a steady state position. On current evidence we see no need to drive the figure down further, but we should be able to maintain it at close to this level whilst at the same time reducing significantly the extra expenditure we have directed to these roads in recent years. We have therefore set a target to keep the figure below 10%.

12.241 Amongst our Best Value group of 13 similar counties, our baseline figure is top quartile, with only one county showing a better figure at 8.9%. For LTP2 provisional targets, the 36 county comparison is combined with other authorities and only shows directions of change. Where provisional targets were set, the majority were for an improvement in condition

12.242 The trajectory is as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	9.6%	<10%	<10%	<10%	<10%	<10%	<10%

12.243 We will monitor annually using coarse visual inspection of 25% of the network of unclassified roads each year. As with other maintenance targets, we will review this in the context of the final TAMP.

12.244 Our key action is to maintain the steady state condition of unclassified roads through our well established programme of inspection and prioritised methods of repair and renewal. On this basis, there is considered to be little risk of not meeting the target.

Key outcome – category 1 & 2 footway condition

12.245 Category 1 & 2 footways are mainly in urban areas where the largest numbers of pedestrians are found. Our indicator is continued from LTP1 and the target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Mandatory (BV187)	% of Category 1 & 2 (the busier) footways with significant defects	9.6% 2003/04	7% 2010/11

12.246 The target is based on continuing the steady rate of improvement achieved in recent years. However, we will analyse further the options for renewal frequency and effective service life to minimise whole life costs as we develop the TAMP.

12.247 Amongst our Best Value group of 13 similar counties, our 2004/05 figure of 8.2% is the best, with the second best county showing a figure of 13.0%. For LTP2 provisional targets, the 36 county comparison is combined with other authorities and only shows directions of change. Where provisional targets were set, the majority were for an improvement in condition.

12.248 The trajectory is as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
9.6%	8.2%	7.8%	7.8%	7.6%	7.4%	7.2%	7.0%

12.249 From our figure of 8.2% in 2004/05 the trajectory is nearly linear throughout the LTP2 period. Monitoring will continue to be based on detailed visual inspections of 50% of these categories of footways each year.

12.250 Our key action is to continue to improve these footways through our established programme of inspection and prioritised methods of repair and renewal. On this basis, there is considered to be little risk of not meeting the target.

Key outcome – category 3 & 4 footway condition

12.251 The majority of footways in the county are in categories 3 & 4. The indicator is new and is based on visual inspection surveys. The target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	% of Category 3 & 4 footways below our condition threshold (visual inspections)	20.7% 2004/05	15% 2010/11

12.252 This indicator is not directly comparable with that used for Category 1 & 2 footways, but we believe a steady state condition will lie in the 10-12% range. The target is provisional, pending more detailed TAMP investigations and costings, and represents the best we believe we can achieve during LTP2, given the need to balance overall expenditure. As a new target, this is particularly susceptible to change in the light of the final TAMP.

12.253 The trajectory is for straight line improvement over the period:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	20.7%	19.7%	18.7%	17.7%	16.8%	15.9%	15%

12.254 Our key action is to continue to improve these footways through our established programme of inspection and prioritised methods of repair and renewal. We believe there is little risk to securing continuous improvement on this basis but, as a new indicator, there are particular risks around calibration and measurement which we will use our TAMP process to refine.

Key outcome – rights of way signposted and easy to use

12.255 The condition of rights of way has been monitored for some years as a Best Value indicator, but is new in LTP2. The target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional (BV178)	% of footpaths and other rights of way that are signposted and easy to use	72% 2002/05 3 yr avg	80% 2008/11 3 yr avg

12.256 With the specified extent of surveys each year, the results have fluctuated for individual years. To reduce this effect in LTP2, a three year rolling average has been adopted for all the figures used, making the outcomes different from the standard BV178 indicator. We have set our target at 80% which will require an additional 240km of the network to be brought up to standard, as well as the upkeep of the majority of the network which is currently in satisfactory condition. Amongst our Best Value comparator group of 13 similar counties, our position in 2004/05 was in the top quartile.

12.257 The trajectory is set on a linear basis as follows:

	2002/05	2003/06	2004/07	2005/08	2006/09	2007/10	2008/11
3 yr avg	72%	73%	74.5%	76%	77.5%	79%	80%

12.258 Monitoring of the indicator is based on surveys of a random sample of 5% of the rights of way network each year. Each surveyed length is tested against 10 criteria, and is classified as defective if any one criterion is not met. From the detailed results each year, the analysis highlights those criteria under which the most defects have occurred, and this strongly influences the maintenance programme for the network as a whole.

12.259 Our key action is to implement the LTP2 capital programmes of improvement and maintenance in line with the emerging rights of way improvement plan. The main risk to achieving the target is that deterioration affects our current satisfactory proportion to a greater extent than allowed for in our maintenance programme. From our extensive experience with rights of way, we judge that this risk is low, and manageable through our detailed analysis and response to emerging trends in defects.

Key outcome – bridges below critical condition thresholds

12.260 The condition of bridges is subject to a new method of inspection using bridge condition indicators (BCIs). The condition of our bridges when assessed against the average of these condition indicators is already very good, and we have therefore chosen to use the more demanding critical data for our indicator. Chapter 9 details the three local indicators we are using, from which we have chosen the most representative to base our LTP2 target on. The proposed target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	% of bridge spans with a critical indicator (BCI) below 75	19% 2004/05	10% 2010/11

12.261 Our use of BCIs for bridge inspections is well established, and all bridges have been inspected at least once using this new method. The baseline figure is the current proportion of bridges below the recognised BCI critical thresholds for needing early attention. Our target is set to reduce this proportion to less than 10%. This will require BCI based repair work to 40 bridges each year in addition to our programme of preventative maintenance of bridges currently above the BCI thresholds. This is challenging within the overall funding available, and will demand careful targeting and excellent value for money in bridge repair work.

12.262 The trajectory is set as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	19%	19%	17%	15%	13%	11.5%	10%

12.263 The reduction in the indicator will not start until 2006/07 following the first year of the LTP2 with our new programme focussed on BCI based bridge repairs. We will monitor through our routine BCI-based inspection programme covering 50% of bridges each year.

12.264 Our key action towards achieving the target is to implement our LTP2 capital programme of BCI-based bridge repairs, combined with our wide range of preventative maintenance work. This preventative work will include particular attention to bridges currently above BCI thresholds, but at risk of early deterioration to below threshold.

12.265 The main risk to achieving the target is the future rate at which bridges will deteriorate to near or below the BCI thresholds. Because BCI based bridge inspections are a recent development, we have yet to complete the second full cycle of inspections, and we are not yet in a position to track rates of deterioration over time. However, our experience over many years is that deterioration in most categories of defect is a slow process. Having made allowance for this in setting our target and developing our programme, we consider the risk to be low, and manageable within our prioritisation of the preventative maintenance work on bridges each year.

Key outcome – street lighting columns needing replacement

12.266 Street lighting columns are a significant highway asset, and we have developed a new indicator to support our renewal programme. The target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	% of street lighting columns needing replacement	19.8% 2004/05	8.2% 2010/11

12.267 We are still completing our street lighting condition inventory for the TAMP, and the indicator for street lighting columns has yet to benefit from this. However, we have analysed the testing and replacement of steel lamp columns, and estimated the future life of our concrete lamp columns, based on the different types that we have and the recognised points of weakness. In the recent past we have only had to replace about 0.5% of our 48,000 steel columns each year, and we expect this renewal rate to continue through the LTP2 period, based on the age profile and types of steel column we have.

12.268 Of the concrete columns, all the Type 1805 and Type 10 columns are in need of replacement, amounting to 19.3% of all our lamp columns. Together with the 0.5% of steel columns each year, this gives our baseline of 19.8%. With our substantial renewal programme, we have set our target at 8.2% which will leave us much closer to our intended long term steady state renewal of less than 3% of columns each year.

12.269 The trajectory is set as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	19.8%	19.3%	17.1%	14.9%	12.7%	10.5%	8.2%

12.270 Following the 0.5% improvement expected in 2005/06, the trajectory is linear throughout the LTP period. Monitoring will take place using our street lighting inventory together with our records of inspection and testing.

12.271 Our key action is to implement the overall LTP2 capital programme which will fund the renewal of more than 1500 lamp columns each year. The main risk to achieving our target would be a significant increase in the currently low annual test failure rate for steel lamp columns. If we had to replace more of these each year than planned, we would not be able to keep up the planned annual replacement of concrete lamp columns. Whilst we do not consider this a likely outcome, there is little we can do to directly manage the risk. However, we could offset the problem by repairing instead of replacing some of our concrete columns, although this would be less cost-effective in the longer term.

Key outcome – traffic signal installations needing renewal

12.272 Traffic signal installations are also a significant highway asset, and we have included a new indicator to support our renewal programme. The target is as follows:

Status	Description	Baseline	Target
Optional	% of traffic signal installations requiring complete renewal (age and fault history)	<4% 2004/05	<4% 2010/11

12.273 In association with our TAMP, we are developing our long term approach to traffic signal renewal and whole life costs. Recent practice has seen complete renewal typically take place at 20 years of age, or in some cases earlier if there is a particular record of poor reliability and high maintenance costs. There is little backlog of renewal at present and our baseline reflects the current rate of renewal each year. The quality of installations has improved since the 1980s, and our current aim for the longer term is to extend the average life of installations to 25 years, with steady state renewal of 4% of installations each year. We have therefore set our target for 2010/11 at the level of 4%.

12.274 The trajectory is as follows:

2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
-	<4%	<4%	<4%	<4%	<4%	<4%	<4%

12.275 We will monitor this indicator using our comprehensive traffic signal database with its analysis of fault history and maintenance costs.

12.276 Our key action towards achieving the target is to implement our LTP capital programme for traffic signal renewal work, prioritised according to current condition as well as age. On this basis there is considered to be little risk of not meeting the target.

Linkage with regional strategy

12.277 As well as ensuring that all government mandatory targets are included, we have also checked our targets for consistency with those set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. We are almost fully consistent, the only exception being that the Regional Spatial Strategy calls for a reduction in congestion in urban areas and on inter-regional routes. Our target, following the analysis described above, is to slow down the growth in congestion, and we do not believe that an overall decrease in our urban areas is achievable over the next five years.

Mandatory indicators proforma

12.278 This is shown on the following pages.

LTP2 Mandatory Indicators Pro-Forma

LTP	Leicestershire
-----	----------------

Core Indicator	Definitions	Year Type	Units	Year	Value	Actual and Trajectory Data										Notes	
						2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11				
Road Condition (% of network in need of further investigation)	(1) Principal Roads - BVPI223	Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2004/05	19.7%	Actual Figures										SCANNER thresholds are being revised which will require resetting of baseline, target and trajectory
				Target Data	2010/11	17.4%	Trajectory										
	(2) Classified, non-principal, roads -	Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2005/06	NA	Actual Figures										SCANNER data not yet available for baseline. This target not required to be set in final LTP2s
				Target Data	2010/11	NA	Trajectory										
	(3) Unclassified roads - BVPI224b	Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2004/05	9.6%	Actual Figures										Notes
				Target Data	2010/11	<10%	Trajectory										
Total killed and seriously injured casualties - BVPI99(x)	Calendar	Casualties	Base Data	2001-04	339	Actual Figures	1994-98	2001-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10	Notes		
			Target Data	2008-10	251	Trajectory	410	339	324	309	294	279	265	251		For 2010 percentage reduction from 1994-98 or the new 2001-4baseline refer to LTP Chaper 12	
Child killed and seriously injured casualties - BVPI99(y)	Calendar	Casualties	Base Data	2001-04	24	Actual Figures	1994-98	2001-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10	Notes		
			Target Data	2008-10	16	Trajectory	43	24	22	20	19	18	17	16		For 2010 percentage reduction from 1994-98 or the new 2001-4baseline refer to LTP Chaper 12	
Total slight casualties - BVPI99(z)	Calendar	Casualties	Base Data	2001-04	2,836	Actual Figures	1994-98	2001-04	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Notes		
			Target Data	2010	2,496	Trajectory	2,773	2,836	2,779	2,722	2,665	2,608	2,552	2,496			
Total local public transport patronage in target	Financial	Thousand passenger journeys	Base Data			Actual Figures		2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	Notes	
			Target Data			Trajectory									For total public transport patronage see bus passenger journeys below		
of which number of bus passenger journeys - BVPI102	Financial	Thousand passenger journeys	Base Data	2003/04	14,918	Actual Figures		2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	Notes	
			Target Data	2010/11	15,759	Trajectory	14,918	14,994	14,994	15,144	15,295	15,448	15,603	15,759			
Satisfaction with local bus services- BVPI104	Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2003/04	58%	Actual Figures		2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	Notes	
			Target Data	2009/10	64%	Trajectory	58%			61%			64%		Only monitored by BVPI triennial surveys in the years indicated		

Core Indicator	Definitions	Year Type	Units		Year	Value		Actual and Trajectory Data								Notes		
								2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11			
Footway condition - BVP1187 (% of the category 1, 1a and 2 footway network where)		Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2003/04	9.6%	Actual Figures	9.6%	8.2%									
				Target Data	2010/11	7.0%	Trajectory	9.6%	8.2%	7.8%	7.8%	7.6%	7.4%	7.2%	7.0%			
LPT1 - An accessibility target	Percentage of households without access to a car within 30 mins of a main centre	Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2004/05	89.7%	Actual Figures		89.7%									
				Target Data	2010/11	>90%	Trajectory		89.7%	89.8%	89.9%	>90%	>90%	>90%	>90%			
LTP2 - Change in area wide road traffic mileage		Calendar	Million vehicle kilometres	Base Data	2003	3,672	Actual Figures	3,672									Excludes motorways and trunk roads, but all figures include A6 and A47 detrunked in 2004	
				Target Data	2010	4,160	Trajectory	3,672	3,741	3,810	3,880	3,950	4,020	4,090	4,160			
LTP3 - Cycling trips (annualised index)		Calendar	Index based on 2000-03 avg = 100	Base Data	2000-03	100	Actual Figures	100										
				Target Data	2010	108	Trajectory	100	100	100	100	101	102	105	108			
LTP4 - Mode share of journeys to school	Share of journeys by car (including vans and taxis), excluding car share journeys	Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2006/07	NA	Actual Figures										Data due to be collected nationally by DfES	
				Target Data	2010/11	NA	Trajectory											
percentage of which Car							Actual Figures											
percentage of which Car Share							Actual Figures											
percentage of which Public Transport							Actual Figures											
percentage of which Walking							Actual Figures											
percentage of which Cycling							Actual Figures											

Core Indicator	Definitions	Year Type	Units		Year	Value		Actual and Trajectory Data								Notes	
								2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11		
LTP5 - Bus punctuality indicator	% of buses starting route on time	Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2005/06	90%	Actual Figures			90%						Provisional baseline and trajectory subject to surveys in 2006	
				Target Data	2010/11	95%	Trajectory			90%	91%	92%	93%	94%	95%		
		Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2005/06	75%	Actual Figures	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11		Provisional baseline and trajectory subject to surveys in 2006
				Target Data	2010/11	85%	Trajectory			75%	77%	79%	81%	83%	85%		
	% of buses on time at intermediate turning points	Financial	Percentage	Base Data	2005/06	NA	Actual Figures	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	To be measured by surveys in 2006	
				Target Data	2010/11	NA	Trajectory										
	Average excess waiting time on frequent service routes	Financial	Minutes	Base Data	2005/06		Actual Figures	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	Not required in Leicestershire	
				Target Data	2010/11		Trajectory										
	LTP6 - Changes in peak period traffic flows to urban centres	Area 1	Financial	Vehicle numbers or % of all journeys that are car driver	Base Data	2005/06		Actual Figures	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	Not required in Leicestershire
					Target Data	2010/11		Trajectory									
		Area 2	Base Data	2005/06		Actual Figures											
			Target Data	2010/11		Trajectory											
Area 3		Base Data	2005/06		Actual Figures												
		Target Data	2010/11		Trajectory												
LTP7 - Congestion	Person journey time per mile on key routes in urban Central Leicestershire 07:30 to 09:30	Financial		Base Data	2004/05	3.95	Actual Figures	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	Shared with Central Leicestershire LTP. Provisional target and trajectory is from CLTM transport model pending spring 2006 completion of surveys and target setting	
				Target Data	2010/11	4.26	Trajectory		3.95								
LTP8 - An air quality target related to traffic	Nitrogen dioxide level Loughborough A6 High Street	Calendar	µg/m3	Base Data	2004	67.7	Actual Figures	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	No trajectory specified in line with guidance. LTP8 requirement is met in total for 9 AQMAs by a further 11 key and intermediate outcome targets	
				Target Data	2010	52.2	Trajectory		67.7								
															52.2		