

APPENDIX D – DERIVATION OF TARGETS

BVPI 99a		All Killed and Seriously Injured Road Accident Casualties				
Definition	Number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of road safety and casualty reduction policies.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	549	540	539	495	(477 was 593)	
	Baseline: 773 – 1994-98 average 2004 performance was 36% below baseline, compared with a target of 40% by 2010. Stretched target for 2005 set as part of LTP2.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	459	441	423	405	387	
	The target has been stretched to achieve a 50% reduction by 2010.					
Unit Cost Estimate	Average value of prevention per accident by severity (2003): Fatal - £1,492,910 Serious - £174, 520					
Benchmarking Information	Number of people killed or seriously injured per million vehicle-km (2003): 0.068 – Cambridgeshire 0.065 - NORTHAMPTONSHIRE 0.063 – Buckinghamshire 0.062 – Warwickshire 0.059 – Oxfordshire 0.056 – Bedfordshire 0.032 – LEICESTERSHIRE					
Background Analysis	Current performance indicates that a more stretching target is appropriate for LTP2. However, there are some concerns about diminishing returns.					
Basis of Forecasts	A target of 50% has been selected as the furthest that the Casualty Reduction Partnership thinks we can stretch and still have a realistic chance of achieving.					
Risk Analysis	There is a low-medium risk associated with this target. The nature of the problem would indicate a medium risk, as there is no absolutely direct link between many of the measures taken and reducing accidents, eg speed limits only work if people slow down. However, past experience would reduce that to low risk because we have proven good at identifying and tackling the causes of accidents.					
Risk Mitigation	We will continue our current policy of analysing accident data to highlight particular themes, including routes and driver types, and targeting our action accordingly.					

BVPI 99b		Child Killed and Seriously Injured Road Accident Casualties				
Definition	Number of children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of road safety and casualty reduction policies.					
Progress during LTP1 Actual/(Target)	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
	76	75	70	58	(57 was 74)	
	Baseline: 104 – 1994-98 average. 2004 performance is 44% below baseline, compared to 2010 target of 50%. Stretched target for 2005 set as part of LTP2.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	56	55	54	53	52	
	The trajectory has been stretched, but the 2010 target is unchanged.					
Unit Cost Estimate	Average value of prevention per accident (all casualties) by severity (2003): Fatal - £1,492,910 Serious - £174, 520					
Benchmarking Information	Number of children killed or seriously injured – rate per million vehicle kilometres (2003): 0.008 NORTHAMPTONSHIRE 0.005 Cambridgeshire 0.004 Oxfordshire 0.004 Warwickshire 0.003 Bedfordshire 0.003 Buckinghamshire 0.001 Leicestershire					
Background Analysis	Current performance is well ahead of target					
Basis of Forecasts	A more stretching target has not been set for this indicator.					
Risk Analysis	There is a low-medium risk associated with this target. The nature of the problem would indicate a medium risk, as there is no absolutely direct link between many of the measures taken and reducing accidents, eg speed limits only work if people slow down. However, past experience would reduce that to low risk because we have proven good at identifying and tackling the causes of accidents.					
Risk Mitigation	We will continue our current policy of analysing accident data to highlight particular themes, including routes and driver types, and targeting our action accordingly.					

BVPI 99c		Slight Road Accident Casualties				
Definition	Number of people slightly injured in road traffic accidents.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of road safety and casualty reduction policies.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	2114	2191	2203	2214	(2276 was 2316)	
	Baseline : 2316 – 1994-98 average					
	Stretched target for 2005 set as part of LTP2.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	2276	2276	2276	2276	2276	
	Target previously only ran to 2005					
Unit Cost Estimate	Average value of prevention per accident by severity (2003): Slight - £17,540					
Benchmarking Information	Rate of slight casualties per million vehicle kilometres (2003): 0.427 Cambridgeshire 0.380 Bedfordshire 0.320 Buckinghamshire 0.294 Warwickshire 0.265 NORTHAMPTONSHIRE					
Background Analysis	We have performed better than our target to keep the number of slight casualties below the baseline.					
Basis of Forecasts	We have therefore set a target to keep slight casualties below 2003 levels. If traffic grows by the 15% that we expect over the next five years, that will equate to a decline in the slight casualty rate of 45% compared to the 1994-98 baseline.					
Risk Analysis	There is a low-medium risk associated with this target. The nature of the problem would indicate a medium risk, as there is no absolutely direct link between many of the measures taken and reducing accidents, eg speed limits only work if people slow down. However, past experience would reduce that to low risk because we have proven good at identifying and tackling the causes of accidents.					
Risk Mitigation	We will continue our current policy of analysing accident data to highlight particular themes, including routes and driver types, and targeting our action accordingly.					

BVPI 102		Bus Patronage				
Definition	The number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area undertaken each year					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of policies which promote the use of public transport, including the council's bus strategy.					
Progress during LTP1 Actual/(Target)	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
	16,784,000	16,366,000	16,499,000	17,901,000	(18,300,000 was 16,600,000)	
	Stretched target for 2005/06 set as part of LTP2.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	18,800,000	19,500,000	20,000,000	20,400,000	20,800,000	
	The trajectory has been stretched, but the 2010 target is unchanged.					
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	<p>Number of bus passenger journeys per head of population (2003):</p> <p>57.4 – Oxfordshire</p> <p>30.4 – Cambridgeshire</p> <p>28.7 – Bedfordshire</p> <p>28.7 – Warwickshire</p> <p>26.2 – NORTHAMPTONSHIRE</p> <p>24.8 – Leicestershire</p> <p>16.1 – Buckinghamshire</p>					
Background Analysis	<p>The council has recently worked in partnership with bus operators to introduce a number of service improvements which have seen exceptional increases in patronage, eg</p> <p>Great Central Connection – 80%</p> <p>Corby Star Service 1 – 81%</p> <p>Corby Star Service 3 – 90%</p>					
Basis of Forecasts	We believe that this provides us with a good basis on which to work to set a challenging target of a 16% increase in overall bus patronage between 2004/05 and 2010/11.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this target. Improvements to bus services do not directly lead to improvements in patronage. In addition, there is potential for the bus operators to make changes (eg service withdrawals) which may adversely affect the target.					
Risk Mitigation	By working in partnership with the operators to deliver improved services with quality vehicles, improved infrastructure and timetables and effective marketing we believe that we can deliver this challenging target.					

BVPI 103		Public Transport Information Satisfaction				
Definition	The percentage of people surveyed, who were satisfied with the quality of public transport information.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of policies which promote the use of accessibility and public transport, including the council's bus strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	33%	N/A	N/A	
	Triennial survey					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	36%	40%	43%	47%	50%	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	The latest information we have suggests that national average performance is 50%.					
Background Analysis	We have made major strides in improving the quality of our printed information provision in recent years. We are now aiming to extend a similar quality of information to other media.					
Basis of Forecasts	We have set the current national average performance as our target for 2010/11.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium to high level of risk associated with this target. It brings us into new areas of work, and the surveys deal with public perceptions (which may be fickle) rather than quantitative data.					
Risk Mitigation	Extra provision has been made for maintaining real-time information in the NCC budget for 2006/07 onwards.					

BVPI 104		Bus Satisfaction				
Definition	Percentage of people satisfied with the local bus service.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of policies which promote the use of public transport, including the council's bus strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	42%	N/A	N/A	
	Triennial survey					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	49%	51%	53%	55%	57%	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Median – 55%					
Background Analysis	Latest survey data shows that bus satisfaction has improved.					
Basis of Forecasts	As we would expect this to continue as we work with operators to improve services and increase patronage, we have set a target of achieving the current median performance by 2010.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this target. Improvements to bus services do not directly lead to improvements in patronage. In addition, there is potential for the bus operators to make changes (eg service withdrawals) which may adversely affect the target.					
Risk Mitigation	By working in partnership with the operators to deliver improved services with quality vehicles, improved infrastructure and timetables and effective marketing we believe that we can deliver this challenging target.					

BVPI 104u		Bus Satisfaction – Users				
Definition	Percentage of bus users satisfied with local bus services.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of policies which promote the use of public transport, including the council's bus strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	47%	N/A	N/A	
	Triennial survey					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	53%	55%	57%	59%	61%	
	Triennial survey					
Unit Cost Estimate	N/A					
Benchmarking Information	Median – 59% 2003 data: 62% Leicestershire 55% Oxfordshire 54% Cambridgeshire 53% Warwickshire 47% NORTHAMPTONSHIRE 40% Buckinghamshire 38% Bedfordshire					
Background Analysis	Latest survey data shows that bus satisfaction has improved					
Basis of Forecasts	As we would expect this to continue as we work with operators to improve services and increase patronage, we have set a target of achieving the current median performance by 2010.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this target. Improvements to bus services do not directly lead to improvements in patronage. In addition, there is potential for the bus operators to make changes (eg service withdrawals) which may adversely affect the target.					
Risk Mitigation	By working in partnership with the operators to deliver improved services with quality vehicles, improved infrastructure and timetables and effective marketing we believe that we can deliver this challenging target.					

BVPI 165		Pedestrian Crossings				
Definition	The percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people, as a percentage of all crossings in the local authority area.					
Purpose	To monitor how useable our pedestrian crossings are for people with mobility impairments					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	72%	61%	79%	95%	(97% was 100%)	
	Definition changed for 2002/03					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Unit Cost Estimate	Average cost less than £6,000 (based on 41 sites improved in 2004/05)					
Benchmarking Information	2003 data: 100% Buckinghamshire 99% Bedfordshire 91% Warwickshire 84% Leicestershire 79% NORTHAMPTONSHIRE 37% Oxfordshire 27% Cambridgeshire					
Background Analysis	Full compliance with this indicator has almost been achieved.					
Basis of Forecasts	The forecast is to achieve full compliance by 2007/08.					
Risk Analysis	There is a low level of risk associated with this indicator. The scale of the remaining work is known. The main risk would be associated with future crossings not conforming to the standard.					
Risk Mitigation	Policies will be put in place to ensure that all future crossings meet the standard.					



BVPI 178		Rights of Way				
Definition	The percentage of the total length of rights of way in the local authority area that are easy to use by the general public.					
Purpose	To monitor the county council's management of the rights of way network.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	51%	51%	52%	70%	(73%)	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	76%	79%	81%	85%	-	
Unit Cost Estimate	N/A					
Benchmarking Information	Our current performance is top quartile.					
Background Analysis	Our current performance is top quartile.					
Basis of Forecasts	To improve by 3% per annum					
Risk Analysis	There is a low level of risk associated with this indicator providing sufficient funding is available for maintenance.					
Risk Mitigation	Continue maintenance funding. Provide some LTP funding for Rights of Way Improvement Plan.					

BVPI 187		Footway condition				
Definition	Percentage of category 1, 1a and 2 footway network where structural maintenance should be considered.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of spend on maintaining the footway network.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	26%	26%	(26%)	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	26%	25%	23%	21%	20%	
Unit Cost Estimate	Projections based on the cost per km of maintenance schemes under the council's current contract arrangements with Atkins, and a prediction of likely future rates once that contract ends in September 2006.					
Benchmarking Information	2003/04: Top quartile – 20% Median – 27% Bottom quartile – 37%					
Background Analysis	Northamptonshire's current performance is within the 2003/04 second quartile.					
Basis of Forecasts	In line with LTP guidance, forecasts have been based on committed resources – LTP indicative maintenance allocations and committed County Council resources. The available levels of finance are insufficient to maintain footways in a steady state condition.					
Risk Analysis improvement in the target.	There is a low level of risk associated with this indicator, as expenditure leads directly to an					
Risk Mitigation	Continue maintenance funding. Maintenance of roads (including footways) is a Council priority and additional resources have been allocated for highway maintenance in future years.					

BVPI 223		Condition of Principal Roads				
Definition	Percentage of the principal (A) road network in need of repair					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of maintenance spend on the road network.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	6%	8%	9%	N/A	(8%)	
	Data for previous indicator BVPI 96. No information collected for 2004/05.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Targets will be set when 2005/06 data has been collected for the new BVPI 223.					
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available.					
Benchmarking Information	Not available.					
Background Analysis	Northamptonshire's 2003/04 for BVPI 96 performance was within the top quartile.					
Basis of Forecasts	Not available					
Risk Analysis	There is a low-medium level of risk associated with this indicator, as expenditure leads directly to an improvement in the target. There is, however, a degree of uncertainty as to future levels of funding for de-trunked roads.					
Risk Mitigation	<p>A supplementary bid for maintenance of de-trunked roads in 2007/08 will be submitted in July 2006. Post 2008, funding for de-trunked roads will be included in the LTP formulaic allocation.</p> <p>Maintenance of roads is a Council priority and additional resources have been allocated for highway maintenance in future years.</p>					

BVPI 224a	Condition of Non-Principal Roads				
Definition	Percentage of classified non-principal (B and C) roads in need of repair.				
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of maintenance spend on the road network.				
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Actual/(Target)	11%	29%	33%	27%	(25%)
	Data for previous indicator BVPI 97a. 2002/03 increase caused by change in method of measurement required by DfT.				
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Targets will be reviewed when data has been collected for the new BVPI 224a.				
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available.				
Benchmarking Information	Not available.				
Background Analysis	Northamptonshire's 2003/04 performance for BVPI 97a was within the bottom quartile.				
Basis of Forecasts	Not available				
Risk Analysis	There is a low level of risk associated with this indicator, as expenditure leads directly to an improvement in the target. Major risk is associated with lack of information as to the life expectancy of the road network.				
Risk Mitigation	Maintenance of roads is a Council priority and additional resources have been allocated for highway maintenance in future years. Better information about the deterioration will be provided as part of the development of Transport Asset Management Plans.				

BVPI 224b		Condition of Unclassified Roads				
Definition	Percentage of classified unclassified roads in need of repair.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of maintenance spend on the road network.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	15%	34%	31%	20%	(29%)	
	Data for previous indicator BVPI 97b2002/03 increase caused by change in method of measurement required by DfT.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	29%	28%	26%	24%	23%	
Unit Cost Estimate	Projections based on the cost per km of maintenance schemes under the council's current contract arrangements with Atkins, and a prediction of likely future rates once that contract ends in September 2006.					
Benchmarking Information	2003/04 (BVPI 97b): Top quartile – 18% Median – 22% Bottom quartile – 27%					
Background Analysis	Northamptonshire's 2003/04 performance was within the bottom quartile.					
Basis of Forecasts	In line with LTP guidance, forecasts have been based on committed resources – LTP indicative maintenance allocations and committed County Council resources.					
Risk Analysis	There is a low level of risk associated with this indicator, as expenditure leads directly to an improvement in the target. Major risk is associated with lack of information as to the life expectancy of the road network.					
Risk Mitigation	Maintenance of roads is a Council priority and additional resources have been allocated for highway maintenance in future years. Better information about the deterioration will be provided as part of the development of Transport Asset Management Plans.					

LTP 1a		Accessibility				
Definition	Percentage of settlements with more than 3,000 population – bus service within each hour (7.00 am – 6.00pm).					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the council's accessibility strategy and public transport policies.					
Progress during LTP1 Actual/(Target)	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	88%	
	Data for previous indicator BVPI 97b2002/03 increase caused by change in method of measurement required by DfT.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	88%	88%	92%	96%	100%	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available.					
Benchmarking Information	Not available.					
Background Analysis	Progress during LTP1 increased the proportion of rural household within 13 minutes walk of an hourly bus service (a different indicator) from 29.3% (in 2001/02) to 34.8% in 2004/05.					
Basis of Forecasts	Target for all settlements over 3,000 population to have an hourly bus service by the end of LTP2.					
Risk Analysis	This has a medium risk. Target can be directly influenced by the provision of additional revenue funding for more services. However, there is some risk of commercial services being withdrawn, which has the potential to adversely affect the indicator.					
Risk Mitigation	The Council has allocated additional revenue funding for bus services. We will work with the operators to promote overall increases in patronage which should help to discourage withdrawal of commercial services.					

LTP 1b		Accessibility				
Definition	Percentage of settlements with less than 3,000 population – at least a daily bus service.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the council's accessibility strategy and public transport policies.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	66%	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	66%	68%	72%	76%	80%	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available.					
Benchmarking Information	Not available.					
Background Analysis	Progress during LTP1 reduced the percentage of residents in villages between 500 and 3,000 population without a daily bus service (a different indicator) from 3.6% (in 2001/02) to 1.1% in 2004/05.					
Basis of Forecasts	Aspirational target to increase the number of villages with a daily bus service by a third by the end of LTP2.					
Risk Analysis	This has a medium risk. Target can be directly influenced by the provision of additional revenue funding for more services. However, there is some risk of commercial services being withdrawn, which has the potential to adversely affect the indicator.					
Risk Mitigation	The Council has allocated additional revenue funding for bus services. We will work with the operators to promote overall increases in patronage which should help to discourage withdrawal of commercial services.					

LTP 2		Countywide Traffic Flow				
Definition	The total amount of traffic on all roads in the county, measured in million vehicle – kilometres.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the council's congestion strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	7,693	8,021	8,318	8,453	(8,825)	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	9,089	9,362	9,643	9,932	10,230	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available.					
Benchmarking Information	<p>Traffic growth between 1994 and 2004, top 5 English local authority areas:</p> <p>44% - Tameside</p> <p>37% - Oldham</p> <p>31% - Doncaster</p> <p>29% - Northamptonshire</p> <p>28% - Leicestershire (excluding Leicester and Rutland)</p>					
Background Analysis	Traffic growth between 1994 and 2004 was 29%, broadly in line with the figures detailed in the Road Traffic Reduction Report submitted alongside our first LTP.					
Basis of Forecasts	Based on the above historic data, we have set a target for traffic to grow by no more than 3% per annum.					
Risk Analysis	The risk related to this indicator is high, due to the levels of growth expected in the county and the large proportion of traffic on roads which are not with the council's control.					
Risk Mitigation	The Council will pursue its Congestion Strategy and work with planning authorities and developers to reduce the amount of road traffic generated by new developments.					

LTP 3		Cycling Index				
Definition	Number of cycling trips in the county (expressed as an index)					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of policies to promote cycling.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100	
	Index of 100 in 2004 represents 20,459 trips.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	100	100	100	100	100	
Unit Cost Estimate	N/A					
Benchmarking Information	N/A					
Background Analysis per annum.	Historic data (not directly comparable) shows that cycling has been declining at about 1% per annum.					
Basis of Forecasts	The council has therefore set a target of stabilising cycling trips at 2004 levels.					
Risk Analysis	There is a high degree of risk associated with this indicator, as there is no certainty that new cycling routes will be used. There is a low level of suppressed demand for the use of new cycling routes.					
Risk Mitigation	Cycling measures must be well targeted to ensure that they provide new routes which will encourage people to walk and cycle more. Physical measures will be accompanied by publicity which encourages people to cycle more.					

LTP 4a		Mode Share Primary				
Definition	Percentage of primary school children travelling by various modes.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of Safer Routes to School schemes, School Travel Plans and related policies.					
Progress during LTP1 Actual/(Target)	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
				48%	(47%)	
	The above figures relate to travel to school by car or car share. There are further figures for travel by bus, walk and cycle.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	46%	46%	45%	44%	42%	
	The above figures relate to travel to school by car or car share. There are further targets for travel by bus, walk and cycle.					
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	No information available for just primary pupils.					
Background Analysis	Existing data shows that car trips to all schools are currently increasing by over 2% per year.					
Basis of Forecasts	The targets are based on a 25% reduction in single-child car trips over six years (2004 – 2010)					
Risk Analysis	The risk related to achievement of this target is high. Policies and measures introduced will not necessarily result in modal shift, which frequently requires some change in parental life styles.					
Risk Mitigation	We will reduce this risk by accompanying physical measures with marketing campaigns, and adopting a holistic approach to dealing with all school travel issues.					

LTP 4b		Mode Share – Secondary				
Definition	Percentage of primary school children travelling by various modes.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of Safer Routes to School schemes, School Travel Plans and related policies.					
Progress during LTP1 Actual/(Target)	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
				25%	(25%)	
	The above figures relate to travel to school by car or car share. There are further figures for travel by bus, walk and cycle.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	25%	24%	24%	24%	23%	
	The above figures relate to travel to school by car or car share. There are further targets for travel by bus, walk and cycle.					
Unit Cost Estimate	N/A					
Benchmarking Information	No information available for just secondary pupils					
Background Analysis	Existing data shows that car trips to all schools are currently increasing by over 2% per year.					
Basis of Forecasts	The targets are based on a 25% reduction in single-child car trips over six years (2004 – 2010)					
Risk Analysis	The risk related to achievement of this target is high. Policies and measures introduced will not necessarily result in modal shift, which frequently requires some change in parental life styles.					
Risk Mitigation	We will reduce this risk by accompanying physical measures with marketing campaigns, and adopting a holistic approach to dealing with all school travel issues..					

LTP 5		Bus Reliability – Northampton				
Definition	Percentage of buses in Northampton arriving between one minute early and five minutes late of their stated arrival time.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy and encourage further use of public transport.					
Progress during LTP1 Actual/(Target)	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	82.3%	
	Data refers to the percentage of vehicles on time at intermediate stops					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	Information from the bus operators shows that journey times on bus routes in Northampton have been lengthening.					
Basis of Forecasts	Not yet available.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this indicator, improvements can be designed which should reduce existing congestion – however, background traffic levels might grow and negate this effect.					
Risk Mitigation	Bus priority measures will be carefully designed to ensure that they speed up buses without them getting stuck in additional congestion. Strategies across the LTP will work to contain traffic growth, particularly in the larger towns.					

LTP 6		Peak Traffic Flow Northampton				
Definition	The amount of in-bound traffic entering Northampton town centre between 7am and 10am.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12117	
	Flows on all roads					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	12117	12117	12117	12117	12117	
	Flows on all roads					
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	Counts over the more limited period of 8am to 9am showed traffic levels fall from 8960 to 8303 (7.3%) between 1999 and 2005					
Basis of Forecasts	Given the growth expected in the town, and the greater scope for traffic growth over a longer peak period, we have set a target for no increase in traffic.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this target. Measures to encourage modal shift require a change in people's travel habits which is difficult to guarantee. However, in a congested urban situation there is limited additional road space and so the potential for increased flows can be limited.					
Risk Mitigation	Measures aimed at modal shift will be targeted at key corridors where they are likely to have the greatest effect.					

LTP 7a		Northampton Congestion am				
Definition	Number of signal controlled junctions in Northampton which are over capacity for more than 50% of the period 7am to 9.30am.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	9	8	7	6	5	
	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available.					
Background Analysis	Without intervention, the number of junction could be expected to increase.					
Basis of Forecasts	To halve the number of such junctions over the LTP period.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this indicator. Analysis indicators that measures can be taken to improve conditions at these junctions, but it is this will be negated by further growth in car traffic					
Risk Mitigation	Improvements will be targeted at key junctions, and accompanied by measures to encourage modal shift on the corridors involved.					

LTP 7b		Northampton Congestion pm				
Definition	Number of signal controlled junctions in Northampton which are over capacity for more than 50% of the period 4pm to 6.30pm.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	11	9	8	7	6	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	Without intervention, the number of junction could be expected to increase.					
Basis of Forecasts	To halve the number of such junctions over the LTP period.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this indicator. Analysis indicators that measures can be taken to improve conditions at these junctions, but it is this will be negated by further growth in car traffic					
Risk Mitigation	Improvements will be targeted at key junctions, and accompanied by measures to encourage modal shift on the corridors involved.					

LTP 7c		Kettering Congestion am				
Definition	Number of signal controlled junctions in Kettering which are over capacity for more than 50% of the period 7am to 9.30am.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	0	0	0	0	0	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	Without intervention, the number of junction could be expected to increase.					
Basis of Forecasts	To halve the number of such junctions over the LTP period.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this indicator. Analysis indicators that measures can be taken to improve conditions at these junctions, but it is this will be negated by further growth in car traffic					
Risk Mitigation	Improvements will be targeted at key junctions, and accompanied by measures to encourage modal shift on the corridors involved.					

LTP 7d		Kettering Congestion pm				
Definition	Number of signal controlled junctions in kettering which are over capacity for more than 50% of the period 4pm to 6.30pm.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	1	1	1	0	0	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	Without intervention, the number of junction could be expected to increase.					
Basis of Forecasts	To halve the number of such junctions over the LTP period.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this indicator. Analysis indicators that measures can be taken to improve conditions at these junctions, but it is this will be negated by further growth in car traffic.					
Risk Mitigation	Improvements will be targeted at key junctions, and accompanied by measures to encourage modal shift on the corridors involved.					

LTP 7e		Wellingborough Congestion am				
Definition	Number of signal controlled junctions in Wellingborough which are over capacity for more than 50% of the period 7am to 9.30am.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	0	0	0	0	0	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	Without intervention, the number of junction could be expected to increase.					
Basis of Forecasts	To halve the number of such junctions over the LTP period.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this indicator. Analysis indicators that measures can be taken to improve conditions at these junctions, but it is this will be negated by further growth in car traffic.					
Risk Mitigation	Improvements will be targeted at key junctions, and accompanied by measures to encourage modal shift on the corridors involved.					

LTP 7f		Wellingborough Congestion pm				
Definition	Number of signal controlled junctions in Wellingborough which are over capacity for more than 50% of the period 4pm to 6.30pm.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	0	0	0	0	0	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	Without intervention, the number of junction could be expected to increase.					
Basis of Forecasts	To halve the number of such junctions over the LTP period.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this indicator. Analysis indicators that measures can be taken to improve conditions at these junctions, but it is this will be negated by further growth in car traffic.					
Risk Mitigation	Improvements will be targeted at key junctions, and accompanied by measures to encourage modal shift on the corridors involved.					

LTP 8		AQMA on NCC Roads				
Definition	The number of declared Air Quality Management Areas relating to roads for which the council is highway authority.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the congestion strategy.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	0	0	0	0	2	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	4	4	2	2	0	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available. However a provisional budget of £1.5million has been allocated to tackle the two declared AQMAs and a further £1.585million to tackle hot spots.					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	There are twelve further areas where air quality levels are causing concern and there is potential for AQMAs to be declared.					
Basis of Forecasts	We expect 2 further AQMAs may be designated before our air quality strategy has any effect, and will aim to have no AQMAs by the end of the LTP2 period.					
Risk Analysis	There is a high level of risk associated with this strategy, particularly as this is a new area for the County Council to tackle.					
Risk Mitigation	We will use the experience of other authorities who have previously tackled AQMAs to guide our work. We have also allocated substantial budgets to this area to ensure that improvements are targeted.					

Local 1		Motorcycle Casualties				
Definition	The number of motorcyclists who are killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of road safety and casualty reduction strategies. Motorcyclists have been identified as a particular problem in Northampton.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	87	90	122	87	76	
	Base year - 2002					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	<107	<102	<98	<94	<94	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	Following a notable high in 2003, casualties were substantially reduced in 2004, but we await further data to see whether this dramatic reduction is sustainable.					
Basis of Forecasts	The Casualty Reduction Partnership has set a target aimed at restoring casualties to their base level by 2010.					
Risk Analysis	There is a low-medium risk associated with this target. The nature of the problem would indicate a medium risk, as there is no absolutely direct link between many of the measures taken and reducing accidents, eg speed limits only work if people slow down. However, risk is reduced to our experience in this area.					
Risk Mitigation	We will continue introduce specific measures and campaigns aimed at tackling motorcycle casualties, including working with experienced motorcyclists to highlight problems.					

Local 2		Corby Killed and Seriously Injured Road Accident Casualties				
Definition	The number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents in Corby					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of our Safer Routes to Corby scheme					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A				34 average (34)	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	32	30	28	26	25	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Our targets have been based on the results achieved by the Gloucester Safer City Urban Safety Management demonstration project.					
Background Analysis	Not available.					
Basis of Forecasts	To reduce the total number of casualties by 26%, based on experience with the Gloucester scheme.					
Risk Analysis	There is a low-medium risk associated with this target. The nature of the problem would indicate a medium risk, as there is no absolutely direct link between many of the measures taken and reducing accidents, eg speed limits only work if people slow down. However, this risk should be reduced by our past track record in the field of casualty reduction.					
Risk Mitigation	We will continue our current policy of analysing accident data to highlight particular themes, including routes and driver types, and targeting our action accordingly.					



Local 3		Kettering Bus Patronage				
Definition	Number of passengers on local bus services in Kettering					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the bus improvements in Kettering.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	1.04m	1.03m	(1.05m)	
	New indicator – figures not available.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	1.26m	1.51m	1.54m	1.57m	1.60m	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Patronage increase on Corby Star service 1 (81%) and service 3 (90%)					
Background Analysis	Scheme expected to be at least half as successful as the Corby Star scheme.					
Basis of Forecasts	A 40% increase in patronage added to a 2% per annum underlying trend (BVPI 102). Trajectory based on service improvements early in 2006.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this target. Improvements to bus services do not directly lead to improvements in patronage. In addition, there is potential for the bus operators to make changes (eg service withdrawals) which may adversely affect the target.					
Risk Mitigation	By working in partnership with the operators to deliver improved services with quality vehicles, improved infrastructure and timetables and effective marketing we believe that we can deliver this challenging target.					

Local 4		Wellingborough Bus Patronage				
Definition	Number of passengers on local bus services in Wellingborough					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of the bus improvements in Wellingborough.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	0.45m	0.50m	(0.51m)	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	0.52m	0.62m	0.75m	0.76m	0.78m	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Patronage increase on Corby Star service 1 (81%) and service 3 (90%)					
Background Analysis	Scheme expected to be at least half as successful as the Corby Star scheme.					
Basis of Forecasts	A 40% increase in patronage added to a 2% per annum underlying trend (BVPI 102). Trajectory based on service improvements early in 2006.					
Risk Analysis	There is a medium level of risk associated with this target. Improvements to bus services do not directly lead to improvements in patronage. In addition, there is potential for the bus operators to make changes (eg service withdrawals) which may adversely affect the target.					
Risk Mitigation	By working in partnership with the operators to deliver improved services with quality vehicles, improved infrastructure and timetables and effective marketing we believe that we can deliver this challenging target					

Local 5a		Nitrogen Dioxide levels – St James AQMA				
Definition	The concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide (in parts per billion) recorded in the St James Air Quality Management Areas					
Purpose	To monitor our success in tackling the St James Air Quality Management Area					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	24.6	28.9	33.8	(28.9)	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	26.0	23.0	21.0	<21.0	<21.0	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Exceedence level for Nitrogen Dioxide is 21ppb.					
Background Analysis	Nitrogen Dioxide levels exceed the desired level so an AQMA has been designated.					
Basis of Forecasts	To bring levels of Nitrogen Dioxide within the desired level					
Risk Analysis	There is a high level of risk associated with this strategy, particularly as this is a new area for the County Council to tackle.					
Risk Mitigation	We will use the experience of other authorities who have previously tackled AQMAs to guide our work. We have also allocated substantial budgets to this area to ensure that improvements are targeted.					

LTP 5b		Nitrogen Dioxide levels – Victoria Promenade AQMA				
Definition	The concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide (in parts per billion) recorded in the St James Air Quality Management Areas					
Purpose	To monitor our success in tackling the St James Air Quality Management Area					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	22.1	30.2	31.0	(30.2)	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	27.0	24.0	21.0	<21.0	<21.0	
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available					
Benchmarking Information	Exceedence level for Nitrogen Dioxide is 21ppb.					
Background Analysis	Nitrogen Dioxide levels exceed the desired level so an AQMA has been designated.					
Basis of Forecasts	To bring levels of Nitrogen Dioxide within the desired level					
Risk Analysis	There is a high level of risk associated with this strategy, particularly as this is a new area for the County Council to tackle.					
Risk Mitigation	We will use the experience of other authorities who have previously tackled AQMAs to guide our work. We have also allocated substantial budgets to this area to ensure that improvements are targeted.					

Local 6		Walk & Cycle Trip Rate				
Definition	The number of walking or cycling trips per person per day, as recorded using a Travel Diary Survey.					
Purpose	To monitor the contribution of walking and cycling to people's overall health.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.47	
	This is a new indicator, and no previous information is available. However, it is reasonable to expect that trip rates will have fallen over the LTP1 period.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	0.49	0.52	0.55	0.58	0.62	
	The 2010 target represents a 30% increase over the 2005 baseline.					
Unit Cost Estimate	No information available.					
Benchmarking Information	Not available.					
Background Analysis	Existing levels of walking and cycling are low, causing problems for congestion and people's health/					
Basis of Forecasts	This is an aspirational target. The target of one additional walking and cycling trip per week would represent a 30% increase over baseline level. This is a challenging target, but has the advantage of being easily communicable as part of marketing campaigns.					
Risk Analysis	There is a high degree of risk associated with this indicator, as there is no certainty that new walking and cycling routes will be used. There is a low level of suppressed demand for the use of new walking and cycling routes.					
Risk Mitigation	<p>Walking and cycling measures must be well targeted to ensure that they provide new routes which will encourage people to walk and cycle more.</p> <p>Physical measures will be accompanied by publicity which encourages people to walk and cycle more.</p>					

Local 7		Total Number of School Travel Plans				
Definition	The number of schools with an approved travel plan					
Purpose	To monitor the implementation of travel planning across the county's schools					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	21	34	74	142	(174)	
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	205	237	269	302	335	
	The target is for all schools in the county to have a travel plan by 2010, in line with DfT and DfES guidance.					
Unit Cost Estimate	Not available. Schools use a number of methods for drawing up their travel plans, some of which may have no direct financial cost.					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	The target of all schools in the county having a travel plan by 2010 has been set in accordance with DfT and DfES analysis.					
Basis of Forecasts	This is a straight line forecast between 2004/05 and 2010/11.					
Risk Analysis	The trajectory involves an additional 32 (approx) travel plans being approved each year. This is in line with recent achievement since the school travel plan team was expanded following the receipt of grant from DfT. The grant is currently available up to 2008.					
Risk Mitigation	We will continue to work with schools to encourage them to draw up their plans. DfES reward funding is available for schools with an approved travel plan up to 2008.					

Local 8		Young Driver Casualty Rate				
Definition	The number of young drivers (age 17-24) killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents.					
Purpose	To monitor the effectiveness of road safety and casualty reduction policies.					
Progress during LTP1	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Actual/(Target)	56	51	52	48	63	
	Baseline: 80 – 1994-98 average.					
LTP2 Target Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
	58	53	48	44	40	
	The 2010 target represents a 50% reduction on the 1994-98 baseline.					
Unit Cost Estimate	Average value of prevention per accident by severity (2003): Fatal - £1,492,910 Serious - £174,520					
Benchmarking Information	Not available					
Background Analysis	As part of our annual review of casualty figures, the young driver casualty rate has been identified as a particular problem area, particularly following an increase between 2004 and 2005. It has therefore been felt appropriate to set a local target.					
Basis of Forecasts	The target has been set at 50%, the same as other targets for reducing killed and seriously injured road casualties.					
Risk Analysis	There is a low-medium risk associated with this target. The nature of the problem would indicate a medium risk, as there is no absolutely direct link between many of the measures taken and reducing accidents, eg speed limits only work if people slow down. However, past experience would reduce that to low risk because we have proven good at identifying and tackling the causes of accidents.					
Risk Mitigation	We will continue our current policy of analysing accident data to highlight particular themes, including routes and driver types, and targeting our action accordingly.					

APPENDIX E

LIST OF LTP SECTIONS COMPRISING THE BUS STRATEGY

Section	Title	Relevant sub-sections
2.2.3	Northamptonshire's Transport Network	Coach Services/Bus Services
2.3.2	Congestion – Buses	All
2.4.8	Access to passenger transport services	For most bus passengers
3.2.2	Alternatives to Car Travel	All
3.2.2.1	Urban Bus Services	All
3.2.2.2	Inter-Urban Bus Services	All
3.2.2.3	Rural Bus Services	All
3.2.2.5	Bus Information	All
3.2.2.6	Bus Promotion	All
3.2.2.7	Improving access to the transport network	Improving access to the bus network
3.2.3.2	Park & Ride	All
3.3.2.1	The role of public transport	All
3.3.2.2	The role of community and voluntary transport	All
3.3.2.8	The role of ticketing and fares	All
3.3.2.9	The role of information	All
3.3.2.10	The role of marketing / publicity	All
3.3.2.11	Meeting the needs of people with mobility impairments	For public transport/Buses
3.8.5	Providing the basis for growth	Buses
3.8.6	Capacity	Public Transport

APPENDIX F – STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT METHOD STATEMENT

As part of the County Council's on-going work to implement the Local Transport Plan, we have been closely involved with a wide range of groups. Representatives of the Sustainable Transport Service take part in a large number of groups including:

- Local Strategic Partnership
- Quality Bus Partnerships
- Freight Quality Partnerships
- Casualty Reduction Partnership
- Local Access Forum

In addition, representatives of the service are regularly involved in discussions with Parish, District and Borough Councils and members of the public.

At East Midlands regional level and across the MKSM growth area we are in regular contact with other local authorities, the Highways Agency, the Strategic Rail Authority, the Regional Assembly and the Government Office(s).

The above contacts have provided us with much valuable information and contacts and have provided much valuable information which has fed into the preparation of LTP2.

LTP2 Issues Consultation and Preparation of the Provisional Plan

We commenced the preparation of the second Local Transport Plan early in 2004.

- An initial round of meetings was held internally with key officers to identify policy changes since LTP1 and key challenges for the future.
- Meetings were then held with key internal officers and representatives of borough and district councils to formally launch the process.
- An Issues Paper was prepared, asking 21 key questions about transport in the county. This was widely circulated and the results used in preparing the plan.
- As part of the Issues Consultation, a series of seven workshops was held during September and October 2005 for key stakeholders at locations throughout the county. Representatives of the LTP team also attended meetings such as County Council Area Committees and Local Strategic Partnerships together with specialist groups such as the Social Inclusion Group, Walking and Cycling Forum and Quality Bus Partnership.

- Early in 2005, we held discussions with all 10 adjoining local transport authorities, together with the Strategic Rail Authority and Highways Agency. This allowed those involved to share ideas and also to identify cross-border issues which needed to be tackled. Key issues identified included the A605, cross-border bus routes and the MKSM Growth Area.
- As a result of these discussions, the authorities within the MKSM growth area have formed a joint working group to help develop and implement their LTPs.
- The developing LTP2 has been presented to the County Council cabinet and Environment & Transport Scrutiny Committee before being approved by the Council. During the run-up to the County Council election in May 2005, the LTP2 team met with the three political parties represented on the council to exchange information and ideas.

Throughout this process, the County Council has maintained regular contact with the Government Office for the East Midlands and also the regional liaison contact from the Department for Transport.

Stakeholder involvement in the preparation of the final plan.

Following the submission of the Provisional LTP to the Department for Transport and Government Office for the East Midlands in July 2005, further consultation was held during September and October 2005 to inform the preparation of the final plan:

- A further series of seven workshops was held during September and October 2005 for key stakeholders at locations throughout the county. Representatives of the LTP team also attended meetings such as County Council Area Committees and Local Strategic Partnerships together with specialist groups.
- As an extension to the previous consultation methods, an exhibition bus was hired and visited 11 different venues across the county during the course of the week. While the exhibition bus was promoted via local media, its key role was to seek involvement from members of the community who would not attend one of the other consultation events.
- Likewise, two targeted workshops were held to engage with sections of the community which were not well represented at other events. These included ethnic minorities, women, young people, those with disabilities and single parents. Specialist consultants were engaged to assist with this work.
- A separate workshop was held to discuss issues relating to the Strategic Environmental Assessment, although environmental issues were also discussed at other events.
- Stakeholder engagement has also continued as part of the further development of the Accessibility Strategy.

As a result of the consultation, written or verbal feedback was received from in excess of 400 people or organisations. The results from the consultation were generally supportive of the approach being adopted in the plan. However, a variety of detailed concerns were raised. Key issues included:

- suggestion that the congestion strategy should highlight “Alternatives to the car” before “Demand Management”;
- a lack of rural focus in the plan;
- the need for a more broadly-focused Accessibility Strategy;
- concern about the effectiveness of proposals for walking and cycling;
- concern about the environmental impact of possible proposals for dualling the A605;
- concern about the impacts of proposed growth on the transport network, and the speed with which improvements could be put in place; and
- concern about the availability of resources for highway maintenance.

All of these issues have been addressed in the revised plan, although there remains more work to do on defining and obtaining further funding for growth-related infrastructure.

The Council’s Environment and Transport Scrutiny Committee formed a sub-committee of seven councillors to consider the plan in depth. They scrutinised each of the plan’s seven objectives in turn. Meetings were held in public. As part of their work they commissioned independent consultants to review the plan. The sub-committee reported their conclusions to the Council’s cabinet meeting in February 2006. Their report included 25 key recommendations, of which 22 could be accepted, although not all the recommendations were directly related to the writing of LTP2.

A meeting was held with representatives of DfT and GOEM in November 2005 to gain initial feedback on the Provisional plan. As a result of this meeting an action plan was drawn up to tackle the points raised. This action plan was further developed following the formal feedback which accompanied the December 2005 settlement letter, and a further meeting in January 2006.

Continued dialogue has also been held with adjoining authorities. The MKSM authorities LTP group has continued to meet and share issues of common concern and best practice. The County Council hosted a meeting for adjoining authorities to discuss issues relating to accessibility planning.

As a result of the consultation, scrutiny and feedback more than 70 substantive revisions have been made compared with the Provisional plan. This excludes minor alterations to the text. The following key changes have also been made:

- re-ordering of the congestion strategy to prioritise “Alternatives to the car” ahead of “demand management”;

- further development of the Accessibility Strategy, including proposals for a significant improvement in rural bus services as part of the LAA;
- proposals for an extensive series of weight restriction zones across the county; and
- revision of targets for road maintenance, to take account of additional funding identified in the draft Medium Term Plan.

Stakeholder and Partner Engagement in shaping the Plan

In addition to the overall consultation on the plan, we have also engaged with particular partner and stakeholders to develop the plan. Examples include:

- We worked with both the Highways Agency and the former Strategic Rail Authority to develop our proposals relating to trunk road and rail networks. This involved ensuring consistency with national policies and joint areas of working. It also involved adopting a realistic stance as to the level of investment that might be possible.
- We have worked with bus operators, through our Quality Bus Partnership, to develop proposals which can deliver a real change in bus patronage and usage. We have drawn heavily on the wider experience of operators to replicate success.
- We have worked with Rail User Groups to develop a strategy for developing rail in the county, including the inclusion of the principle of supporting the reopening of the Northampton to Bedford line in the MKSM joint statement.
- We worked with the Cyclist’s Touring Club in drawing up our cycling strategy. This has led to a focus on providing safer cycling facilities linked to demand, and the dedication of a walking and cycling budget.
- We have worked with the health authorities to develop the Kettering Health Accessibility Action Plan, and at their suggestion we have included an objective for healthier travel within the plan.
- We have worked with Local Strategic Partnerships and Rural Transport Partnerships to develop a wider accessibility strategy, including our model for core and feeder bus services.
- We have worked with the emergency services and other partners through our Casualty Reduction Partnership to develop the second Casualty Reduction Strategy which forms the basis of the Road Safety priority within the plan.
- We have worked closely with environmental health colleagues at Borough and District Councils to starting developing Action Plans for the Air Quality Management Areas in the county, and to appreciate the wider air quality problems in the county.
- We have worked with colleagues at District and Borough Councils, Local Delivery Vehicles and other transport authorities in the MKSM sub-area to continue to develop proposals for meeting the needs of growth in the county.