

## 5 TARGETS AND INDICATORS

In section 1.2, we set out the objectives of this Plan. They can be summarised as:

- maintaining the transport network;
- reducing casualties;
- reducing congestion;
- improving accessibility;
- managing the growth agenda;
- minimising the effect of traffic on the environment; and
- encouraging healthy travel choices.

In order to measure our progress towards these objectives we have developed a series of indicators, which are set out below. For each indicator we have set a target for the end of the LTP period, and a trajectory for progress over the intervening years. We will monitor our performance against these targets and trajectories on a continuous basis and report the results in our LTP2 Delivery Reports.

Performance against our targets will also be a key determinant of future funding levels from the Department for Transport.

In order to monitor progress against the plan's objectives, we will be using the mandatory indicators set out in the LTP guidance, and supplementing them with a number of local indicators appropriate to our circumstances. The following table sets out the indicators that we will be monitoring over the plan period (mandatory indicators are in bold), and highlights which of the objectives they relate to.

### Opposite Page - Table 5.1 – Links between Indicators and Objectives

A full explanation of the derivation of the targets set for each indicator is set out in Appendix D. This includes a formal definition of the indicator, our experience with progress during the LTP1 period, relevant unit cost estimates, benchmarking information, examples of similar performance in other areas, background analysis and the basis of the forecasts from which targets have been set.

The appendix also includes a summary of the risks associated with each target and the proposed mitigation measures.

### Our Performance Management Approach

The Sustainable Transport service introduced a new performance management system in spring 2005. Each team within the service is allocated a number of key objectives within the departmental service plan, including those linked to the delivery of the Local Transport Plan. Progress in meeting these

objectives is reported to a monthly monitoring meeting where senior managers challenge team leaders on their progress in meeting their service plan objectives. The inclusion of budget monitoring in this process helps to ensure that any difficulties and delays in key areas are picked up.

The process has been successful in highlighting key areas in need to attention at any early opportunity, and focusing management attention where it is needed to ensure problems are resolved. Action to deal with issues raised at the monthly meetings can either be reported back to the next or subsequent meetings or where necessary additional meetings can be organised to resolve particularly difficult issues.

We are now extending this process to play an even more central role in the LTP delivery process. Towards the end of each financial year, following the annual LTP settlement, team leaders will be asked to bring to the monthly monitoring meeting their LTP budget proposals for the coming year, including the expected contribution of their proposals to meeting targets. Following a critical review of the proposals, the programme for the coming year will then be finalised. Throughout the year, team leaders will then report on their progress in implementing these schemes. At the same time, team leaders will also report on the progress of indicators for which they are responsible. The frequency of reporting will depend on the frequency of data collection for individual indicators.

Where the reporting of indicators gives cause for concern, senior managers will then be able to consider the appropriate action to take. The principle behind our approach is that this action should be taken at the earliest opportunity. This could involve putting more human or financial resources into a particular area of work, or it could involve reviewing the planned schemes and interventions to ensure that they are still appropriate.

While the presumption would normally be that the trajectories for our indicators are fixed for the five-year period of the LTP, we need to have a system in place for reviewing them should the need arise. This could involve a review to set a more stretching target, or a less demanding one. A more stretching target will be considered where an indicator has been ahead of target for two consecutive years, and there is a reasonable expectation that this improved performance can continue. A less demanding target will be considered where performance has been below target for two consecutive years, and remedial action (in terms of adjusting the programme or allocating more resources) has been tried but has had no discernible effect. Particularly where we were considering setting a less demanding target, we would also seek to draw on the experience of other authorities. In both cases, we would discuss the situation with the Government Office for the East Midlands before setting a new target.

Table 5.1 – Links between Indicators and Objectives

Ref	Indicator	Quality of Life objectives							Page number
		Maintenance	Safety	Congestion	Accessibility	Growth	Environment	Healthy Travel	
BVPI 96	Principal Road Condition	X	X						209
BVPI 97a	Non-Principal Road Condition	X	X						209
BVPI 97b	Unclassified Road Condition	X	X						209
BVPI 99a	All KSI casualties		X						206
BVPI 99b	Child KSI casualties		X						206
BVPI 99c	Slight casualties		X						206
BVPI 102	Bus Patronage			X	X	X	X		211
BVPI 103	Public Transport Information Satisfaction			X	X				205
BVPI 104	Bus Satisfaction			X	X	X	X		203
BVPI 104u	Bus Satisfaction - Users			X	X	X	X		203
BVPI 165	Pedestrian Crossings		X		X			X	205
BVPI 178	Rights of Way							X	209
BVPI 187	Footway Condition	X	X					X	209
LTP 1	Accessibility				X				205
LTP 2*	Countywide Traffic Flow			X		X			201
LTP 3	Cycling Index			X				X	208
LTP 4a	Mode Share Primary			X				X	204
LTP 4b	Mode Share Secondary			X				X	204
LTP 5a	Bus Reliability – Northampton			X	X	X	X		203
LTP 5b	Bus Reliability – X4			X	X	X	X		203
LTP 6	Peak Traffic Flow N'pton			X		X			201
LTP 7a	Northampton Congestion am			X		X			202
LTP 7b	Northampton Congestion pm			X		X			202
LTP 8	AQMA on NCC roads			X		X	X		207
Local 1	Motorcycle Casualties		X						207
Local 2	Corby KSI Casualties		X						207
Local 3	Kettering Bus Patronage			X	X	X			202
Local 4	Wellingborough Bus Patronage			X	X	X			202
Local 5a	NO2 – St James						X		208
Local 5b	NO2 – Victoria Prom						X		208
Local 6	Walk & Cycle Trip Rate							X	208
Local 7	School Travel Plans			X				X	204
Local 8	Young Driver Casualties		X						207

Table 5.2 – LTP Programming and Monitoring Timetable

Year 0	
August	PMs to produce draft capital programme for following year. Initial estimates of target impact.
	LTP team to review with ref to available performance info and any previous budget variations to be tracked so overall spend remains on track. Discuss revised program with PMs / STMT. Budget info then prepared for MTP.
November	Review budget in light of half year performance monitoring data
	PMs work up more detailed proposals on coming year's programme. Hone down target impacts. Possible scrutiny of budget proposals.
February	Detailed info on schemes for coming year. Agree impact of each scheme on targets for Performance Management purposes. Formal approval to proceed following NCC budget meeting.
	PMs start to commission schemes.
Year 1	
May	Detailed information on budgeted spend for this year as required by NCC centre. Include info for LTP finance forms and Proforma C as required for APR.
	LTP team collate information into APR and report to STMT on any issues of concern.
	PMs progressing schemes.
August	STMT having previously carried out 'high-level' review of current year programme in light of performance reported in APR – deal with any consequential revisions to programme.
	PMs to be highlighting any delivery problems with schemes.
November	Review programme in light of any delivery problems being highlighted or major variances of scheme from what originally planned.
	PMs to deal with any necessary revisions to programme
February	-
	PMs to finalise delivery of schemes.
Year 2	
May	PMs provide information on what has actually been delivered for APR purposes. Also monitoring info where collected other than data team. Review achievement of programme in relation to targets.
	LTP team to collate responses into APR. LTP team highlights any performance / variance issues and agrees solutions with STMT in time to be included in APR. Revised budget allocations circulated to PMs as basis for year 3 programme.
August	PMs use performance management information in drawing up programme for following year. BEGIN AGAIN AT TOP

**Key:** PMs – Project Managers / Budget Holders  
STMT – Sustainable Transport Management Team

## 5.1 SHARED PRIORITY - CONGESTION

### General Traffic Levels

As set out in earlier chapters of this LTP, we expect underlying traffic growth in the county to remain at around 3% per year over the years covered by the plan.

This view is based on the forecasts set out in the Road Traffic Reduction Report (RTRR) that we submitted with the first LTP, and the growth in actual traffic that has been recorded over the period of LTP1, which broadly fitted the forecasts in the RTRR.

While the impact of our policies will be to restrain local traffic growth there will, due to Northamptonshire's geographic location in the centre of the country, still be growth in through traffic which we are unable to influence – particularly on the trunk road and motorway network. This will be compounded by the increase likely to result from the MKSM growth proposals.

The actual level of future growth will depend to a great extent on both the general economic condition of the country and region, and also the rate at which the proposed growth of the county comes on-stream.

As a result we will be setting a target for this indicator of “no more than 3% growth per annum”. In light of the development of the county we will monitor this target closely and may revise it in the light of the evident growth rate. The indicator is measured in million vehicle kilometres (mvkm) i.e., the total distance travelled by all vehicles in the county in a year, with figures taken from the National Road Traffic Survey

Table 5.3 – Countywide Traffic Flows (mvkm)

LTP2 Indicator	2003 Baseline	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Actual	8,318	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prediction	-	8,568	8,825	9,089	9,362	9,643	9,932	10,230

### Urban Areas

Within the county's urban centres, our policies can have a clear and positive impact on restricting general traffic levels. Our approach to monitoring congestion in urban areas is focused both on the overall level of traffic and on removing specific hotspots.

In the first LTP we set, and successfully achieved, targets to limit the growth in traffic flows into town centres, with no growth in Northampton's peak hour inflow, and a maximum of 7% growth in the 12-hour two-way flows to the other main towns. This allowed us to set a more stretching target for Northampton in the July 2004 Annual Progress Report.

For the second LTP a national indicator has been adopted for traffic flows. This applies only to settlements of over 100,000 people, and thus excludes all towns in the county except Northampton.

This indicator covers inbound flows over the entire peak period from 7.00am and 10.00am, averaged over a two-week period, rather than the previous single day count.

We have set a target of no growth in inbound car traffic.

Table 5.4 – Northampton Inbound Traffic Flow Indicator

LTP6 Indicator	05/06 Actual	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Northampton (all major roads)	11,315	11,315	11,315	11,315	11,315	11,315
Northampton (all roads)	12,117	12,117	12,117	12,117	12,117	12,117

The Council has developed its own measure for congestion at urban hotspots. This relates to the proportion of the peak periods (7.00am to 9.30am, and 4.00pm to 6.30pm) within which vehicles do not clear traffic signalled junctions within one cycle of the lights. Full analysis of all signalled junctions in Northampton, Kettering and Wellingborough has now been completed.

The urban congestion indicator for Northamptonshire will be the number of junctions that are congested for more than 50% of the peak period. The target will be to halve the number of such junctions over the LTP period.

Table 5.5 – Congestion Indicators

LTP7 Indicator	2005 Actual	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target
Northampton am	10	9	8	7	6	5
Northampton pm	12	11	9	8	7	6
Kettering am	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kettering pm	1	1	1	1	0	0
Wellingborough am	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wellingborough pm	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Public Transport

One of the key tools for reducing traffic congestion is the increased use of public transport. In recognition of this, the DfT has set out two mandatory indicators relating to bus patronage (BVPI102) and satisfaction with bus services (BVPI104).

Declining bus patronage has been evident across the country since the 1950s. Against this trend, we set challenging targets for increasing bus patronage in the first LTP. We are currently on target to achieve these as shown below:

Table 5.6 – Bus Patronage Current Performance

BVPI102	2000 Baseline	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	2010 Target
Target	-	17.2m	17.2m	15.7m	15.6m	18.0m
Actual	16.1m	17.2m	16.2m	16.5m	17.9m	-

In the light of the proposed improvements to bus services set out within this document, we are now revising our target for 2010/11 to be 20.8m passenger journeys, and set out below the new trajectory.

Within this overall total we include local indicators for the effects of the planned Kettering and Wellingborough improvements, which are based on the success of the Corby Star scheme. In the light of the Corby experience we have set targets for Kettering and Wellingborough that include a 40% growth in patronage following the introduction of similar schemes within the LTP 2 period.

Table 5.7 – Bus Patronage Targets

Indicator	03/04 Baseline	04/05 Actual	05/06 Target	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target	Change
County (BVPI 102)	15.7m	17.9m	18.3m	18.8m	19.5m	20.0m	20.4m	20.8m	+16%
Kettering (Local 3)	1.04m	1.03m	1.05m	1.26m	1.51m	1.54m	1.57m	1.60m	+56%
Well'boro (Local 4)	0.45m	0.50m	0.51m	0.52m	0.62m	0.75m	0.76m	0.78m	+56%

The collection of data for BVPI104 on satisfaction with bus services is only required on a three-yearly cycle. In order to obtain a holistic view of satisfaction levels we will report separately on the situation amongst the general population and amongst current bus users.

Comparing the situation in Northamptonshire with that in other authorities shows that our current performance is in the bottom quartile. The latest information we have suggests that median performance is 59% for bus users and 55% for the general population, and we have adopted these levels as our targets for the tri-annual survey in 2009/10.

However, we now intend to collect satisfaction data in a similar format in intervening years too in order to allow us to track progress on a yearly basis.

Table 5.8 – Bus Satisfaction Targets

BVPI104	03/04 Baseline	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
General Population	42%	49%	51%	53%	55%	57%
Current Bus Users	47%	53%	55%	57%	59%	61%

One of the key determinants of satisfaction amongst bus users is the reliability of the service that they receive. We have therefore set a local indicator to measure the reliability of bus arrival times. We have done this by monitoring data on the proportion of buses arriving between one minute early and five minutes late of their stated arrival time.

Our baseline survey was conducted on a manual basis, but it is intended that future data will be derived from our Real Time Passenger Information system.

As a result of our baseline data appearing reasonably good, and without the benefit of comparative data from other authorities, we have set indicative targets for no worsening in performance over the period of LTP2. However, these will need to be confirmed by the Northamptonshire Quality Bus Partnership that we are forming. This will be an expansion on the existing Northampton-based partnership currently in operation. Any changes to the targets will be reported in our LTP2 Delivery Reports.

Table 5.9 – Bus Reliability Targets: Northampton

LTP5 Indicator	05/06 Baseline	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Starting on time	97.73%	97.73%	97.73%	97.73%	97.73%	97.73%
On time during journey	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%
Average excess waiting time	1 min 01 secs	1 min 01 secs	1 min 01 secs	1 min 01 secs	1 min 01 secs	1 min 01 secs

### School Journey Modal Share

The school journey is one of the major causes of congestion. The proportion of such journeys made by car has been increasing since the 1970s, and is currently increasing by over 2% per year nationally, but there is evidence that this trend has been reversed at schools which have implemented a Travel Plan.

We intend to have such plans adopted by all schools in the county by 2010, and these will assist in delivering the modal shift targets. As the number of schools covered by plans increases over the LTP period, modal shift will accelerate until by 2010/11 we intend, in line with national experience as detailed in Smarter Choices – Changing the Way We Travel, to reduce the proportion of children travelling to school singly by car by a quarter.

Table 5.10 – Primary School Mode Share Targets

LTP4a Indicator – Primary	04/05 Baseline	05/06 Target	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Car	32%	31%	30%	29%	28%	26%	24%
Car share	16%	16%	16%	17%	17%	18%	18%
Bus	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Walk	48%	49%	50%	50%	51%	52%	54%
Cycle	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Table 5.11 – Secondary School Mode Share Targets

LTP4b Indicator – Secondary	04/05 Baseline	05/06 Target	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Car share	11%	12%	12%	12%	12%	13%	13%
Bus	33%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%
Walk	38%	38%	38%	39%	39%	39%	39%
Cycle	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%

In order to support the modal shift target, we have also set targets for the introduction of School Travel Plans. In line with the aims of the Department for Transport and Department for Education and Skills, we intend that all schools in the county will have travel plans in place by 2010. The table below sets out the target number of School Travel Plans per year leading up to 2010.

Table 5.12 – Total Number of Approved School Travel Plans

Local Indicator 7	04/05 Baseline	05/06 Target	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Total number of STPs in county	142	174	205	237	269	302	335

## 5.2 SHARED PRIORITY – ACCESSIBILITY

Our Accessibility Strategy has identified rural areas and transport information as the key indicators to be addressed through intervention via the Northamptonshire Local Area Agreement. This document is still in draft form and is subject to the negotiation of “stretch” targets between partners and the Government Office for the East Midlands.

However, we set out below the “without stretch” targets that form the basis of these negotiations. If and when “stretch” targets are agreed, the alteration will be recorded and progress will be reported through the LTP2 Delivery Report process.

Table 5.13 – Accessibility Targets: Transport Services

LTP1 Indicator	05/06 Base	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
LTP1a: % of settlements with more than 3,000 population - bus service within each hour (7.00am-6.00pm)	88%	88%	88%	92%	96%	100%
LTP1b: % of settlements with less than 3,000 population - at least a daily bus services.	66%	66%	68%	72%	76%	80%

The collection of data for BVPI103 on satisfaction with bus service information is only required on a three-yearly cycle. However, we now intend to collect satisfaction data in a similar format in intervening years too in order to allow us to track progress on a yearly basis.

Comparing the situation in Northamptonshire with that in other authorities shows that our current performance is in the bottom quartile. The latest information we have suggests that national average performance is 50%, and we have adopted this level as our “without stretch” target for 2010/11.

Table 5.14 – Accessibility Targets: Information

BVPI103	03/04 Baseline	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Public Transport Information satisfaction	33%	36%	40%	43%	47%	50%

In order to monitor the accessibility of the highway network for pedestrians, we also intend to continue to use the BVPI65 indicator for the accessibility of pedestrian crossings.

Table 5.15 – Pedestrian Crossing Accessibility Targets

BVPI65	04/05 Baseline	05/06 Target	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Pedestrian Crossings	95%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%

## 5.3 SHARED PRIORITY – ROAD SAFETY

Three national indicators have been prescribed for measuring performance on maintenance, and we are required to include targets for these indicators. The three are:

- BVPI99a The number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI)
- BVPI99b The number of children KSI
- BVPI99c The number of slight casualties

Our performance on BVPI99a and BVPI99b over the last five years has been reported in previous APRs and is detailed below, together with provisional data for 2005:

Table 5.16 – Current Performance – Road Traffic Accident Indicators

Mandatory Indicators	94-98 Average	2004 Actual	2005 Target	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target	Change
BVPI99a	773	738	646	549	540	539	495	492	-36%
BVPI99b	104	90	70	76	75	70	58	57	-45%

The existing targets for these indicators run to 2010 and for BVPI99a and 99b match the national targets of 40% and 50% respectively. In view of our excellent performance to date, the Council has agreed with its partners to set a more stretching target for BVPI99a in this LTP. This target is being stretched to 50% to bring it into line with BVPI99b.

The development of this target was undertaken by way of a comprehensive review of performance to date; not just in engineering, but also in education and enforcement. This took account of the impressive progress to date, but also the diminishing returns evident in engineering schemes as the major problem sites were dealt with, and the adverse trend in motor cycling accidents. A holistic view of what represented a stretching, but achievable target was then taken with the agreement of all partners.

Table 5.17 – Road Traffic Accident Targets

Mandatory Indicators	94-98 Average	2004 Actual	2005 Target	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target	Change
BVPI99a	773	495	492	459	441	423	405	387	-50%
BVPI99b	104	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	-50%

With respect to indicator BVPI99c, during LTP1 the Council deviated from the national target for slight casualties. Nationally, the target was for a 10% decline in the slight casualty rate, expressed as the number of casualties per million vehicle kilometres (the total distance driven by all vehicles). In the absence of local traffic flow figures at the time when this target was adopted nationally, the Council agreed to set a target of no growth in slight casualties despite rising traffic levels. The national indicator has now been revised so that it too is for the number of casualties.

In the light of our performance exceeding the national target, we are setting a stretched target for slight casualties. This will be to keep slight casualties at their current level of 2% below the baseline.

Table 5.18 - Targets for Slight Casualties

Mandatory Indicator	94-98 Average	2004 Actual	2005 Target	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target
BVPI99c	2316	2276	2276	2276	2276	2276	2276	2276

Within the overall total of KSI casualties, the number relating to motor-cyclists has run counter to the overall trend, and has attracted specific attention. The total for 2003 was 34% higher than in the base years. As a result, our Casualty Reduction Partnership set a specific target for this class of KSI, aimed at restoring casualties to their base level by 2010.

Table 5.19 – Targets for Motorcycle Casualties

Local Indicator 1	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Target	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target	Change
MC KSI Target	n/a	<117	<112	<107	<102	<98	<94	90	-26%
MC KSI Actual	122	87	76	-	-	-	-	-	-

A second key group within the overall total of KSI casualties are young car drivers (aged 17-24). Whilst the total number had declined from 55 in the base years to 31 in 2004, the number has risen again in 2005. As a result, our Casualty Reduction Partnership set a specific target for this class of KSI, aimed at achieving an overall 50% reduction in KSI by 2010.

Table 5.20 – Targets for Young Car Drivers

Local Indicator 8	94-98 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Target	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target	Change
YD KSI Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	58	53	48	44	40	-37%
YD KSI Actual	80	48	63	-	-	-	-	-	-

We have identified Corby as an area of specific deprivation within the county, and one with a complementary road safety problem. We will be introducing a programme of safety measures within the town, and have set specific targets for the reduction in KSI casualties as set out below:

Table 5.21 – Targets for Casualties in Corby

Local Indicator 2	02-04 Average	2005 Target	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target	Change
Corby KSI	34	34	32	30	28	26	25	-26

## 5.4 SHARED PRIORITY – AIR QUALITY

Our primary environmental indicator will be the number of declared Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in the county. These may relate to the road network for which either the Council or the Highways Agency is responsible.

In 2005 the number of declared AQMAs in Northamptonshire is two on the trunk road and motorway network, and two on the non-trunk network, with twelve other areas causing concern across the network.

Given the likelihood of further AQMAs being designated in Northampton, and the lengthy timeframe within which AQMA Action Plans are developed and introduced, the trajectory for reducing the numbers on the non-trunk network to zero by 2010 is non-linear, as set out below.

Table 5.22 – Number of AQMA Target

LTP8 Indicator	05/06 Baseline	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
AQMAs on NCC roads	2	4	4	2	2	0

For each of the currently designated AQMAs, we will set targets and trajectories for reducing Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) levels, measured in particulates per billion.

We have set targets to reduce emissions to the intervention level in both existing AQMAs by 2008/09, and to keep them below intervention levels thereafter.

Table 5.23 – Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) Targets for Designated AQMAs

Local Indicator 5	2003 Baseline	05/06 Target	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
St James	28.9	28.9	26.0	23.0	21.0	< 21.0	< 21.0
Victoria Prom	30.2	30.2	27.0	24.0	21.0	< 21.0	< 21.0

## 5.5 LOCAL PRIORITY – HEALTHIER TRAVEL

We have identified the promotion of healthy travel choices as a local priority following public consultation during the development of the LTP. To measure the impact of our policies and programmes we will use three indicators; the number of walking trips per person per day, the number of cycling trips per person per day, and the accessibility of rights of way (BVPI178).

The number of walking and cycling trips has been ascertained by means of a travel diary survey conducted countywide for the first time in 2005. We intend to increase these trip rates by one walking or cycling trip per person per week over the plan period – equivalent to a 30% increase

We have not specified the breakdown between walking and cycling trips as the current ratio is so highly skewed to pedestrians. The number of reported cycling trips per person per day is currently just 0.02, compared to 0.45 walking trips.

Table 5.24 – Walking and Cycling Trip Rate Target

Local Indicator 6	05/06 Baseline	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Walking and cycling trips (per person per day)	0.47	0.49	0.52	0.55	0.58	0.62

In addition, the DfT requires that we measure the annualised index of the number of cycle trips. This figure is obtained from a network of automatic cycle counters situated, at the current time, mainly in the Northampton area. We intend to expand this network over the plan period, and will re-base the index to take account of these changes. Thus, the absolute number of cycle movements recorded will rise by more than the index itself.

Over recent years this index has been declining at 1% per year. However, in view of the additional work we plan to do on key cycling corridors, we have set a target of reversing this trend and stabilising cycle trips at their current level.

Table 5.25 – Cycling Index Indicator

LTP3 Indicator	2003 Baseline	05/06 Target	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Cycle trips	13,726	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Index	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

One key component of our drive to increase walking trips is the county's rights of way network. BVPI178 measures the proportion of rights of way that are easy to use. Our current performance on this measure is top quartile and we intend to maintain that position.

Table 5.26 – Rights of Way Indicator

BVPI178	05/06 Baseline	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
Rights of Way	70%	73%	76%	79%	82%	85%

## 5.6 LOCAL PRIORITY - MAINTENANCE

Three national indicators have been prescribed for measuring performance on road maintenance, and one for footway maintenance. We are required to include targets for each of these indicators within our LTP. The four are:

- BVPI223 Principal Road Condition (was BVPI96)
- BVP224a Non-Principal Road Condition (was BVPI97a)
- BVP224b Unclassified Road Condition (was BVPI97b)
- BVPI187 Footway Condition (categories 1 & 2)

In each case, the indicator refers to the proportion of roads or footways in each category that are in need of repair.

In accordance with the guidance, we have selected 2003/04 as the baseline for the BVP224b and BVPI187 indicators, and targets are set out in table 5.25.

However, we have not yet acquired baseline data on BVPI223 or 224a. We had planned to use 2004/05 data for BVPI223, but there were difficulties in carrying out the relevant automated surveys across the country. Although all authorities, including Northamptonshire, made arrangements to procure surveys in accordance with the methodology, and two of the three survey companies managed to complete their contractual requirements in time, about 15% of the principal road network was not surveyed. This included Northamptonshire. Data for BVPI224a is being collected for the first time in 2005/06.

Once the 2005/06 data for both these indicators is available, in late Spring 2006, we will set targets for BVPI223 and 224a and report these in our July 2006 LTP1 Delivery Report. This approach has the agreement of Department for Transport. In the meantime, the Department have asked that we set shadow targets for BV96, showing the indicative change we would have made had this indicator continued in use.

In determining the targets we are setting for these indicators we have analysed the performance of other County Council's compared to other authorities, and found that in 2003/04 the relevant performance levels were as follows:

Table 5.27 – Current Performance – Maintenance Indicators

Mandatory Indicators	Northants 03/04	Northants 04/05	Top Quartile 04/05	Median Point 04/05	Bottom Quartile 04/05
BVPI96 / BVPI223	9% top quartile	n/a	29%	39%	48%
BVPI97a / BVPI224a	33% bottom quartile	27% bottom quartile	9%	15%	21%
BVPI97b / BVPI224b	31% bottom quartile	20% third quartile	11%	15%	21%
BVPI187	n/a second quartile	26% third quartile	16%	23%	34%

Since the production of the provisional LTP, the Council has been able to produce a draft budget covering the four years from 2006/07 that sees expenditure on maintenance from revenue resources growing by £8m. This increase will bring spending back into line with that required to maintain the highway asset.

As a result, we are now able to set targets for an improvement in the BV187 and BV224b indicators, and this will be reflected in similar improvements in BV223 and BV224a once the baselines have been determined. We have included a trajectory for an improvement in BV96 to illustrate the general scope of the improvement we intend to make.

Table 5.28 – Maintenance Targets

Mandatory Indicators	03/04 Baseline	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target
BVP223	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
BVP97a/224a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
BVP97b/224b	31%	29%	28%	26%	24%	23%
BVP187	6%	26%	25%	23%	21%	20%
BVPI96 (Indicative)	9%	9%	8%	8%	7%	7%

## 5.7 LOCAL PRIORITY - GROWTH

We have not selected any specifically growth-related transport indicators, but the impact of growth is included in the other objectives' indicators.

## 5.8 IMPACT OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Section 4.9 of the LTP set out how we would allocate additional expenditure table should funding be made available at 125% of our indicative allocation.

Clearly, the additional allocation, if it were granted, would allow us to make further progress on those indicators to which the funding was directed.

These fall into two main groups: **Casualty Reduction (including Safer Routes to School); and Congestion (including capacity improvements, public transport schemes and walking and cycling corridors).** The key changes are highlighted below:

### Casualty Reduction

The additional casualty reduction expenditure of £1million would all be on engineering schemes directed specifically at KSI reduction. For each predicted KSI saving, our economic rates of return calculations allow a maximum expenditure of approximately £100,000. This indicates a saving of an additional 10 casualties over the LTP period. In addition, a smaller contribution would come from the roundabout programme.

In addition, we would spend an additional £967,000 on Safer Routes to School schemes, which are predicted to achieve additional reductions in the child KSI totals. This allows us to stretch the child KSI target to 54%.

This change is also included in the overall KSI target, which would be stretched to 52%.

Table 5.29 – Road Traffic Accident Targets (125% funding)

Local Indicator 8	94-98 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Target	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target	Change
YD KSI Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	58	53	48	44	40	-37%
YD KSI Actual	80	48	63	-	-	-	-	-	-

A further stretched target for BVPI 99a of 55% is being proposed as part of Northamptonshire's Local Area Agreement.

The acceleration of the Safer Roads for Corby project would change the shape of the trajectory rather than the final target.

Table 5.30 – Targets for Casualties in Corby (125% funding)

Local Indicator 2	02-04 Average	2005 Target	2006 Target	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target	Change
Corby KSI	34	34	32	30	27	26	25	-26%

## Congestion

With the enhanced funding as set out in section 4.9, expenditure on capacity improvements are boosted by one junction per year from 2007/08.

Table 5.31 – Congestion Indicators

LTP7 Indicator	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Target	2008 Target	2009 Target	2010 Target
Northampton am	10	9	8	7	6	4
Northampton pm	12	11	9	7	5	5
Kettering am	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kettering pm	1	1	1	1	0	0
Wellingborough am	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wellingborough pm	0	0	0	0	0	0

Capital expenditure on public transport would increase by £1million (20%) over the plan period, allowing us to set stretched targets for patronage as the result of introducing additional quality bus corridor schemes, bus priority measures and Real Time Passenger Information.

Table 5.32 – Bus Patronage Targets (125% funding)

Indicator	03/04 Baseline	04/05 Actual	05/06 Target	06/07 Target	07/08 Target	08/09 Target	09/10 Target	10/11 Target	
County	15.7m	17.9m	18.3m	18.8m	19.5m	20.2m	20.8m	21.5m	+20%