Performance Management: Targets and Indicators

15.1 Introduction

A crucial element of the LTP is performance management. To fulfil this role, it is necessary to assess whether the LTP2 strategies and actions are delivering the shared priorities and local objectives. This is done by establishing a set of performance indicators with targets to monitor progress through the LTP2 five-year period.

In setting these performance indicators and targets, a number of aspects have to be borne in mind. Firstly, the Government has set a number of basic requirements:

- The targets have to be challenging but realistic given the level of funding that is likely over the LTP2 period.
- There are a number of mandatory indicators.
- There should be an emphasis on targets to measure outcomes (the benefits that will be achieved) rather than outputs (the number of schemes that have been implemented).

Secondly, there are a number of local considerations:

- The need to ensure that the cost of monitoring the indicators and targets is commensurate with the value of the indicators and targets themselves.
- The benefit of continuing performance indicators and targets developed through Wiltshire’s first LTP.

15.2 Performance Management

The County Council has a structured and systematic approach to monitoring performance. A recent Audit Commission report on Performance Management stated that the Council:

“monitors achievement of objectives and has devised a reporting timetable which allows reviews to feed into service and financial planning. It produces a single comprehensive quarterly performance report which includes performance across the Council and focuses on its key priorities and LPSA targets, but also provides detailed key performance indicator information in a structured and easy to understand format. The report is owned by the chief executive, presented to cabinet and performance scrutiny task group and is circulated to directors for review.”
The report also states that “there is evidence that the Council is shifting resources to ensure that priorities are delivered”.

Quarterly performance reviews against corporate goals are undertaken. These show progress against targets, trends and comparison with other county councils, and comments on variations and action. Each performance indicator is assigned to a chief officer, and through the service planning process, to senior managers. Members and chief officers receive reports on key performance indicators, and the Council has recently started to post transport performance indicators on the Council’s intranet.

15.3 Monitoring Framework

The performance of the LTP2 is monitored through the use of outcome indicators that record whether the LTP2 is achieving the desired effect. These are supported, where required, by output indicators summarising progress with the LTP2 implementation.

Certain indicators are prescribed by the DfT. These are complemented by local indicators representing progress towards the Council’s objectives. The choice of indicator is dependent upon the need to meet as far as practicable a number of criteria:

• It must reflect progress towards the Council’s objectives.
• It should be meaningful to a wide audience.
• It should be sufficiently accurate to allow meaningful comparisons between years.
• It should be representative of the area to which it applies.
• It should provide useful feedback for the performance management regime.
• It should be economical to measure.

Where possible, use has been made of the indicators and experience gained during the first LTP period, and data collection established over many years. This includes:

• Traffic counts at over 100 permanent automatic count sites.
• Annual manual traffic counts at town cordons / screenlines.
• Thrice-yearly manual counts of pedestrians and cycles in each major town.
• Twice-yearly rail boarding counts.
• Collection of bus patronage figures from operators.
• Annual travel-to-school mode-share surveys.
• Collection of accident statistics from police recording.
• Collection of road and footway condition information from automatic and visual surveys.
• Collection of rights-of-way condition information from manual surveys.
• Databases including the register of street works.
15.4 Performance Indicators and Targets

Wiltshire’s indicators and targets are contained in the following tables, which have a standard format presenting baseline and target data, together with reasoning supporting the target chosen.

In setting targets, four principal inputs have been used:

• Examination of past trends;
• Analysis of factors that would be expected to modify the projection of the trend in the future;
• Benchmarking against provisional targets chosen by other authorities for mandatory indicators; and
• Feedback from consultation on the draft LTP that included specific questions on 20 indicators and consideration of spending allocation.

Trends in indicators can be obscured by real unpredictable variability of the quantity being measured, or by sampling error in the measurements. For the road safety indicators this variability has been assessed and used to indicate a range for the expected number of casualties (given that the underlying trend is on track to the target).

Indicators have been referenced using DfT-specified LTPx numbers for mandatory indicators and the standard BVx numbers for Best Value indicators. Local indicators are numbered compatibly with the Council’s recent LTP APRs. The key to the LTP2 objectives is contained in Chapter 2, Table 2.4.

15.5 Risk Management

Each of the indicators has an associated section identifying risks and outlining the means by which the effect of these risks on the outcome may be reduced.

Circumstances may arise where the appropriate response is to increase funding of actions in support of achieving the target for a particular indicator. To increase funding for one objective usually involves cutting funding supporting another objective. Therefore, the risk management strategy is tied to the prioritisation of investment, an approach which was supported at the LTP Forum event held in February 2006. The prioritisation process is defined in Section 5.5.

15.6 Performance Indicator Tables

The following index lists Wiltshire's indicators using a four-level hierarchy defined by the DfT, and provides a link to the main table for each indicator. Mandatory indicators are shown in bold type.
### Key indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTP1h</td>
<td>Access to bus services</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP1d</td>
<td>Access to voluntary car schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP1v</td>
<td>Access to voluntary car schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP8</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV99x</td>
<td>Road safety: Total Killed or Seriously Injured</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV99y</td>
<td>Road safety: Children Killed or Seriously Injured</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV99z</td>
<td>Road safety: Slight casualties</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV102</td>
<td>Bus patronage</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intermediate outcome indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTP2</td>
<td>County-wide vehicle-km</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP3</td>
<td>Index of cycle trips</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP4</td>
<td>Travel to school (car mode share)</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP5</td>
<td>Bus punctuality</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV104</td>
<td>Satisfaction with bus services</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV223</td>
<td>Condition of principal roads</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV224a</td>
<td>Condition of non-principal classified roads</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV224b</td>
<td>Condition of unclassified roads</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV187a</td>
<td>Condition of footway categories 1,1a &amp; 2</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD1</td>
<td>Devizes urban traffic</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS1</td>
<td>Salisbury cordon traffic</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW1</td>
<td>Western Wiltshire urban traffic</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD2</td>
<td>Inter-urban traffic in Devizes Community Area</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS2</td>
<td>Inter-urban traffic in Salisbury area</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW2</td>
<td>Inter-urban traffic in Western Wiltshire</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR2</td>
<td>Inter-urban traffic in non-strategy areas</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD3</td>
<td>Cycling in Devizes</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS3</td>
<td>Cycling in Salisbury</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW3</td>
<td>Cycling in Western Wiltshire</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD4</td>
<td>Walking in Devizes</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS4</td>
<td>Walking in Salisbury</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW4</td>
<td>Walking in Western Wiltshire</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>Rail passengers</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW25t</td>
<td>Journey time reliability (journey time proxy)</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW25w</td>
<td>Journey time reliability (road works proxy)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS27</td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride passengers in Salisbury</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP8b</td>
<td>Air quality proxy (traffic in Bradford on Avon)</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP8w</td>
<td>Air quality proxy (traffic in Westbury)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP8s</td>
<td>Air quality proxy (Traffic in Salisbury)</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L16</td>
<td>Cyclist casualties (indicator only)</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L17</td>
<td>Pedestrian casualties (indicator only)</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB8</td>
<td>Proportion of footpaths which were easy to use (BV178)</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting output indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>Number of cycle schemes completed</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L23</td>
<td>Proportion of routes operated by low-floor buses</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td>Workplace travel plans</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS28</td>
<td>Number of off-street long-stay parking spaces in central Salisbury</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29</td>
<td>Completed key bus route upgrades</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Completeness of Traveline data</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Verification of Traveline data</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local outcome indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L30</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Street Scene</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Targets and Indicators


#### Target (daily)
- 89% 88% 86% 84% 82% 80%

#### Actual (daily)
- 86% 86% 86% 90% 90% 89%

#### Target (hourly)
- 61% 59% 56% 54% 52% 50%

#### Actual (hourly)
- 62% 62% 62% 64% 65% 61%

#### Definition
Proportion of rural addresses within 800m of a bus stop with an hourly / daily or better weekday daytime service.

#### Data source
Bus timetables (SWPTI database), computer mapping of bus stops and postal addresses.

#### Target
- For hourly or better services, to maintain accessibility from at least 50% of rural addresses.  
- For daily or better services, to maintain accessibility from at least 80% of rural addresses.

#### Evidence
It has been possible over the last few years to maintain the improved service levels achieved when the Rural Bus Subsidy Grant was introduced in 1997-8 despite above inflation cost increases, although this has required a doubling of WCC revenue funding over the period since 1999. Due to increasing pressures on the Council’s budgets, the Council will not be able to continue to fund further rises in costs, and some reductions in service levels will be inevitable. However, we will seek to minimise the impact on hourly and daily frequencies as far as possible, as these are seen as providing ‘threshold’ levels of accessibility. Mapping on which the target is based can be used to identify the impact of changes in service provision, and also the scope for alternatives such as the potential for serving more addresses by changing to demand responsive rather than conventional service provision.

#### Benchmarking
Wiltshire’s baseline for access to hourly bus services is high compared with most benchmarked authorities, particularly the more rural counties.

#### Consultation
The majority of respondents assessed the old targets of 62% and 90% as being “about right”.

#### Review
Despite the support demonstrated for maintaining existing levels of access in the consultation, the Council’s financial position and the prospect of continuing increases in transport costs means that this is no longer an achievable option. While service reductions will be inevitable, we will seek to ensure that funds are targeted towards the major priorities as identified in the Council’s ‘Guidelines for Expenditure on Supported Bus Services’.

#### Key Actions
- Quality Partnerships, marketing initiatives, Punctuality Partnerships, Kickstart initiatives to boost viability of hourly services. Targeted revenue funding for non-commercial bus and demand responsive services. Continuing integration with education transport to maximise provision. Review of the role of demand responsive transport in potentially providing access to more households.

#### Principal Risks & Management
Continuity of funding for rural bus services, given increasing pressures on revenue budgets and ending of time limited external funding. Rising transport contract costs. Withdrawal of commercial services. Pressures on the budget will be monitored and appropriate action taken when necessary. There is a high level of uncertainty in the forecast service level as this will depend on the extent to which cost increases are actually incurred and the funding that is made available to the Council in future years’ annual financial settlements.
## LTP1v: Proportion of rural addresses served by voluntary car schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ending April</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definition
Proportion of rural addresses within the areas covered by voluntary car schemes.

### Data source
Computer mapping of areas covered; postal delivery point mapping.

### Target
To increase the coverage of voluntary car schemes in rural areas to 94% of addresses by 2010-11.

### Evidence
The Wiltshire Community Transport Directory lists all the ‘LINK’ (good neighbour / transport) schemes in the County and the areas they cover, and a number of other voluntary car schemes. The LINK Development Project, funded through a partnership of the County and District Councils and the Primary Care Trusts (and formerly the Countryside Agency) has worked in recent years to increase coverage of schemes. The ultimate goal is to achieve 100% coverage. The target set involves serving around three additional parishes per year, either through the setting up of a new scheme or extending an existing scheme. Schemes generally cover several parishes.

### Benchmarking
Other local authorities did not have a comparable indicator

### Consultation
Public transport & accessibility was considered a high priority.

### Review
It is considered that the target is reasonable given the capacity of the LINK Development team and the nature of the areas as yet unserved. However, whether it can be achieved will depend on the ability to find willing and enthusiastic local volunteers to run the schemes.

### Key Actions
Continue to support the work of the LINK Development Project to expand the coverage and capacity of LINK schemes.

### Principal Risks & Management
- Inability to find volunteers willing to run new schemes; unwillingness of existing schemes to expand to cover neighbouring parishes as yet unserved; existing schemes cease to operate; capacity of LINK Development Project to develop and expand schemes reduced by withdrawal of funding by one or more partners, or by need to focus more effort on support of existing schemes.
- Progress will be monitored at meetings of the LINK Funders’ Partnership and alternative strategies considered if necessary.
### Target: County-wide vehicle-km (excluding trunk roads and motorway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (million veh-km)</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>3501</td>
<td>3568</td>
<td>3636</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>3759</td>
<td>3822</td>
<td>3886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>3489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition:**
Estimated vehicle-kilometres travelled on County roads (i.e. excluding trunk roads and motorway).

**Data source:**
DfT Annual Traffic Survey.

**Target:**
Growth between 2003 and 2010 to be no more than the low-growth prediction of the National Road Traffic Forecast 1997, with local correction factors from the National Trip-end Model.

**Evidence:**
The target is broadly in line with the separate area targets developed for the first LTP period. CfIT report ‘National Road Traffic Forecasts: Advice by the Commission for Integrated Transport’ suggested an upward revision of forecasts due to changes in central policy including abolition of the fuel duty escalator. However, subsequent traffic growth in Wiltshire has been below the regional average and has tracked the NRTF low growth forecast (adjusted for Wiltshire using factors from the National Trip End Model).

**Benchmarking:**
Amongst shire authorities, Wiltshire has one of the lowest traffic growth rates relative to population growth or relative to predictions from the National Trip end Model and National Road Traffic Forecast (this comparison was inclusive of trunk road and motorways for technical reasons). Wiltshire’s target growth is slightly above the median for county councils reporting targets in their provisional LTP2s.

**Consultation:**
37% of respondents thought the target was about right. Lesser (but balanced) numbers supported raising or lowering the target.

**Review:**
The balance of evidence suggests that the target is correct for the current set of priorities and strategy.

**Key Actions:**
Land-use policy to pursue a balance between housing and employment. Promotion of public transport through improved information, punctuality and interchange.

**Principal Risks & Management:**
The reason for the relatively low traffic growth (in comparison with other shire authorities) has not yet been fully evaluated and so there is a risk attached to assuming that this situation will continue. Factors outside the control of the Council may lead to higher traffic growth. It is unlikely that review of land-use policy would provide a timely correction, while the scope for funding further public transport improvements is limited. Therefore, a regular review of progress will determine if a more active stance on (for example) demand management is required. In circumstances of higher than expected traffic growth, such measures may be more politically and publicly acceptable.
**LTP Objectives**

- P2, P8, P13

**Government Priority**

- Sustainable Communities, Healthy Communities

---

**Table: Index of Cycle Trips**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Growth index of weekday cycle trips crossing cordons in principal Wiltshire towns. To produce a representative indicator the raw counts for each town have been weighted according to the population of the town. A three year rolling mean is used.

**Data Source**

Manual cordon/screenline counts in Calne*, Chippenham*, Corsham, Devizes*, Melksham*, Salisbury*, Trowbridge*, Westbury, Wootton Bassett. (*=3 times per year). Around 5000 cycles are observed annually. The sites chosen feature a mix of journey purposes including commuting and school traffic, but exclude major leisure routes e.g. National Cycle Network.

**Target**

The target is to achieve a 2% increase over the 2003 baseline by 2010.

**Evidence**

Over the period 2001-2004, cycling in Wiltshire continued to decline. In 2005, an increase has been recorded in seven out of nine towns monitored (this increase is less apparent in the moving average depicted in the chart).

The Bishopdown-Laverstock cycleway in Salisbury, opened in 2000, saw its usage decline at a fairly steady 13% per annum over the following four years. This is a route predominantly used for school travel, and a sudden reversal of the trend was observed from September 2005.

Weather is not considered to be a factor leading to the increase seen in 2005. The increase gives some ground for optimism, but it is too early to be certain that the downward trend has been reversed.

**Benchmarking**

Of 11 authorities compared, two had targets for no growth, three had targets up to 10% and the remainder were for higher growth.

**Consultation**

Few respondents thought that the 2% increase proposed in the provisional LTP2 was “too hard”. Those thinking that this was “too easy” marginally outnumbered respondents who thought the target was “about right”.

**Review**

Evidence linking cycle infrastructure improvements with progress towards the priority objectives is not particularly strong, leading to difficulty in justifying schemes to elected members. Considering the declining indicator trend noted until recently, the given target represents a challenge. The indicator will be reviewed to allow the inclusion of further data sources when available.

**Key Actions**

A review of the efficacy of various cycling measures in the Wiltshire Cycle Action Plan will be used to achieve better results later in the LTP2 period. Expenditure on cycling will be higher than for the first LTP period. New (and existing) infrastructure will be promoted through coordination with Travelwise.

**Principal Risks & Management**

The strengths of various factors restraining cycle use (for example, parents’ safety concerns) are currently unquantified. The sampling error of the indicator and yearly variation in actual cycling levels (e.g. due to weather patterns) hinders regular review of progress. A review of the Cycle Action Plan will strengthen the evidence base. Incremental improvements to the monitoring will be sought. The progressive accumulation of data will allow further analysis of local factors affecting cycling.
**LTP4: Travel to school (car mode share)**

---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Target (primary sch.) | 43.6% | 46.5% | 46.5% | 45.5% | 43.5% | 41.5% | 37.6% | 37.6%
Target (secondary sch.) | 18.8% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 19.5% | 19.0% | 17.1% | 15.0% | 15.0%

**Definition**
Mode share of travel to school, reported separately for primary and secondary schools.

**Data source**
Pupil-level Annual School Census supported by locally-organised classroom surveys.

**Target**
To achieve by 2010/11 a mode share travelling by car not car-sharing of: Primary schools: 37.6% or less. Secondary schools: 15% or less.

**Evidence**
All schools will have Travel Plans by 2010/11, and all schools will be “Healthy Schools” by 2010. An analysis of modal share against the geographical catchment size of schools has demonstrated that there is scope for reducing the overall car mode share.

**Benchmarking**
Wiltshire’s provisional LTP2 targets for primary and secondary schools put it at the median of benchmarked authority targets.

**Consultation**
Views on the provisional LTP2 target were divided between “about right” and “too easy”. Opinion on the provisional LTP2 five-year programme had Safe Routes To School schemes as the second highest case for an increased allocation, although the strength of opinion was still not high. The provisional LTP2 allocation for Travel Plans (zero capital funding but 207 schemes via revenue funding) was considered “about right”.

**Review**
Risks have been anticipated for which an appropriate response is available.

**Key Actions**
Encouraging schools to adopt approved travel plans. Walking and cycling infrastructure and passenger transport improvements delivered through the planning system and respective action plans. At least £20,000 revenue per annum will also be spent on education, training, publicity and promotion. The County Council’s Development Control process utilises parking standards that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage sustainable transport modes.

**Principal Risks & Management**
The rising cost of contracted school transport services continues to cause concern. As this is a statutory duty, funding will continue to be made available, but utilisation of school transport will be maximised by ensuring full uptake of free transport entitlements and offering subsidised places to fare-payers where capacity exists.

There is a threat that increasing exercising of parents’ choice of school will lead to longer journeys more likely to be made by car. The Council is working with all schools through the travel plan process to ensure that information for potential new starters provides a clear statement on travel policy and options for accessing sites. The subject should also be dealt with during parent / teacher meetings allowing some personalised travel planning to be discussed at the very earliest stage.

The travel plan process requires the enthusiastic cooperation of schools for which there are competing pressures. Therefore, LTP2 Safer Routes to School budgets have been made conditional upon an approved Travel Plan being developed and implemented.
Chapter 15

LTP5: Bus punctuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (timing point)</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (timing point)</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target (other stop)</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (other stop)</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Percentage of registered bus services observed departing between one minute early and five minutes late (seconds ignored) from timing points and other locations.

**Data source**
Annual programme of roadside surveys at a mixture of origins, timing points and other locations from all areas of the county and with a representative sample of different operators.

**Target**
To attain 90% by 2014/15 for timing points, and 84% for other stops. From 2006/07, the trajectory is linear – early quick wins are expected, while later progress is due to the effects of experience and longer-lead time measures.

**Evidence**
The baseline surveys show 4.1% of departures running more than 1 minute early, 18.6% running more than 5 minutes late, and 2.7% recorded as ‘no show’. Late running was more frequent (21.5%) at points along the route than at the origin (10%).

Initial discussions with major operators at Punctuality Partnership meetings have identified a willingness to engage in active monitoring and joint action to address identified ‘problem areas’. However, although it is anticipated that some ‘quick wins’ will be achievable through adjustments to schedules and traffic management, it is believed that unpredictable traffic conditions will result in a residual level of late running that represents a major challenge. Although locations where delays are a regular occurrence will be investigated by WCC’s Traffic Manager, it is acknowledged that the predominantly rural nature of the County limits the scope for significant bus priority measures.

The limited ability to fund extension of GIS based data gathering will limit progress in extending partnership working to the smaller operators – of which Wiltshire has many.

**Benchmarking**
A number of authorities provisionally set a target of 90% by an earlier date, but the baseline data was not known.

**Consultation**
The predominant response was that the target of 90% by 2014/5 was “about right”.

**Review**
Having established the baseline position and begun to investigate with operators the range of actions available to seek improvement, it is not considered that it would be feasible to adopt a more stretching target at the current time.

**Key Actions**
Punctuality and reliability partnerships with operators, involving active monitoring of punctuality using electronic GIS-based systems and closer working with the Traffic Manager and the Highways Agency, and leading to actions such as adjustments to schedules, traffic management measures, and bus priority where feasible (including traffic signal priority). Continued monitoring of supported services (within available resources). Monitoring to establish and seek to influence trends.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Extent of influence of unpredictable traffic conditions is not yet known. Identification of feasible and affordable actions to resolve problems is difficult to predict on current knowledge. Continuing commitment of major operators. Extent to which it is feasible to extend GIS-based data collection to the smaller operators. These risks will be monitored and reviewed as experience is developed.
LTP8 – Air Quality

**Definition**
Concentration of relevant local pollutant (Nitrogen dioxide for all Wiltshire Air Quality Management Areas).

**Target**
Nitrogen dioxide concentration (annual mean) to be below 40µg/m\(^3\) by 2010 for each of the declared AQMA measuring sites:
- Bradford-on-Avon (Masons Lane, Market Street, Silver Street, St Margaret’s Street)
- Westbury (Haynes Road, Warminster Road)
- Salisbury (Minster Street, Brown Street/Winchester Street, Fisherton Street, Milford Street, Exeter Street)

In line with DfT guidance, no intermediate trajectory is provided. Intermediate progress is measured through proxy indicators.

**Key Actions**
- Salisbury: Salisbury Transport Plan.
- Bradford on Avon: Demand management scheme with a possible bid for money from the Transport Innovation Fund.
- Westbury: Monitoring to ensure that anticipated achievement of target is on-track.

**Principal Risks**
Vehicle emission reductions through technological improvements not as rapid as national predictions.

---

### LTP8b: Air Quality proxy (traffic level in Bradford on Avon)

**LTP Objective**
S1, S11

**Government Priority**
Air Quality, Quality of Public Spaces

**Definition**
Index of traffic volume passing Masons Lane (AADT).

**Data source**
Automatic and manual traffic counts.

**Target**
Traffic volume in 2010 to show a 20% reduction on the 2003 baseline. The trajectory permits growth at up to 1% (which is less than NRTF low growth) up to the time when a traffic management scheme is implemented.

**Evidence**
From air quality modelling, the traffic reduction targeted is expected to lead to pollutant concentrations meeting the 2010 target.

**Benchmarking**
No appropriate benchmark was available.

**Consultation**
Local consultation was undertaken on the strategy.

**Review**
The Air Quality Action Plan for West Wiltshire has been approved by Defra.

**Key Actions**
Bradford on Avon: Traffic management scheme to be introduced before 2010.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Modelling assumptions may be incorrect, in which case the traffic management strategy may need to be modified. This may not be immediately apparent due to the variability of external factors influencing pollutant concentrations.
**LTP8w: Air Quality proxy (traffic level in Westbury)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Index of traffic volume passing Haynes Road (AADT).

**Data source**
Automatic counter.

**Target**
Traffic volume in 2010 to grow no more than 7.7% above the 2004 baseline.

**Evidence**
From the air quality assessment, improvements in vehicle technology will enable the pollutant target to be met provided that traffic growth is no more than the given target.

**Benchmarking**
No appropriate benchmark was available

**Consultation**
Local consultation was undertaken on the strategy.

**Review**
The Air Quality Action Plan for West Wiltshire has been approved by Defra.

**Key Actions**
Traffic flow and air quality will be monitored.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Modelling assumptions may be incorrect. The traffic growth target has been set cautiously to allow for this possibility. Ongoing monitoring will indicate if further action needs to be taken.

**LTP Objective**
S1, S11

**Government Priority**
Air Quality, Quality of Public Spaces
**LTP8s: Air Quality proxy (traffic level in Salisbury)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Index of traffic volume crossing the Salisbury city centre cordon (AADT).

**Data source**
Automatic counter.

**Target**
Traffic volume in 2010 to grow no more than 7.7% above the 2004 baseline.

**Evidence**
From the air quality assessment, improvements in vehicle technology will enable the pollutant target to be met provided that traffic growth is no more than the given target.

**Benchmarking**
No appropriate benchmark was available

**Consultation**
Local consultation was undertaken on the strategy.

**Review**
The Air Quality Action Plan for West Wiltshire has been approved by Defra.

**Key Actions**
Progress with the Salisbury Transport Plan, traffic flow and air quality will be monitored.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Modelling assumptions may be incorrect. The traffic growth target has been set cautiously to allow for this possibility. Ongoing monitoring will indicate if further action needs to be taken.
**Definition**
Proportion of principal road network with at least one type of defect exceeding the moderate deterioration threshold as defined in the national methodology for this indicator.

**Data source**
Surveys are by Scanner, which is a vehicle based machine survey method of recording the surface properties of the carriageway. The survey is only in its second year, and there is some concern about the variability of results to date.

**Target**
A target of a 5% improvement each year has been adopted to achieve 25% by 2010/11. This will be subject to review in light of results and any changes in the assessment procedures.

**Evidence**
The targets are provisional and will need to be reviewed as experience with the assessment methodology increases. Targeting major maintenance schemes at areas of need is expected to result in an overall improvement.

**Benchmarking**
Several of the benchmarked authorities had not provided targets in their provisional LTP2s. Those that did, with one exception, posted larger improvements and/or a better target condition.

**Consultation**
Network management (including maintenance) was given a high priority. Street scene (under which maintenance was also listed) was considered a medium priority. General support for an improving indicator.

**Review**
The target trajectory in the provisional LTP2 has been revised to reflect 2005/06 results. The continuing investment in highway maintenance during the first LTP period has seen a general improvement in carriageway condition. With the financial planning guideline, it is expected that this trend can be continued.

**Key Actions**
Routine and structural maintenance in order to keep the network in good condition; winter maintenance and emergency response; Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP).

**Principal Risks & Management**
Effect of extreme weather; insufficient funding; rising cost of plant and materials. The risk of not achieving the target will be reduced by the adoption of a Matrix approach to prioritising maintenance investment in order to ensure that the sections of road most in need of treatment are considered first. The developing TAMP will contribute to the process.
**BV224a: Condition of non-principal classified roads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Proportion of non-principal classified road network with at least one type of defect exceeding the moderate deterioration threshold as defined in the national methodology for this indicator.

**Data source**
Surveys are by Scanner, which is a vehicle based machine survey method of recording the surface properties of the carriageway. The survey is in its first year and it is difficult to set firm targets with the limited information available.

**Target**
Provisionally, a target of achieving 25% by 2010/11 has been set in line with the target for principal roads. Although a target for this indicator is not mandatory, it was considered that setting a provisional target would be helpful.

**Evidence**
The reaction of this indicator to maintenance investment is not quantified, but it is expected to achieve improvements over the LTP2 period.

**Benchmarking**
Benchmarking for this indicator was not available due to the recent changes in survey methodology.

**Consultation**
Network management (including maintenance) was given a high priority. Street scene (under which maintenance was also listed) was considered a medium priority.

**Review**
The continuing investment in highway maintenance has seen a general improvement in carriageway conditions during the first LTP period and with the financial planning guideline, it is expected that this trend can be continued. The new indicator methodology dictates a provisional target that will need to be reviewed as experience increases.

**Key Actions**
Routine and structural maintenance in order to keep the network in good condition; winter maintenance and emergency response; Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP).

**Principal Risks & Management**
Effect of extreme weather, insufficient funding, rising cost of plant and materials. Investment will be targeted at areas of need in order to reduce risk of not achieving the target. The appropriate maintenance treatment will be adopted for particular locations in order to maximise the effectiveness of available funding. The developing TAMP will contribute to the process.
**Chapter 15**  

**Targets and Indicators**

**BV224b: Condition of unclassified roads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Proportion of unclassified road network deemed to require structural maintenance, obtained by Coarse Visual Inspection procedures.

**Data source**

Information is based on a visual assessment on 25% of the network annually.

**Target**

The target is to maintain the condition generally at existing levels. The slight improvement in 2005/06 may not be realistic as a long term target and it is considered that 2004/05 is more representative.

**Evidence**

Wiltshire’s target condition was at the better end of the range, even though no further improvement was specified. Some authorities specified a declining condition, while improvements were of the order of 2%.

**Benchmarking**

Network management (including maintenance) was given a high priority. Street scene (under which maintenance was also listed) was considered a medium priority. However, safety (road condition being particularly important for the safety of cyclists) was considered a high priority.

**Consultation**

Additional discretionary County Council funding during recent years has improved the condition of unclassified roads, but financial constraints do not allow this to continue.

**Key Actions**

Routine and structural maintenance in order to keep the network in good condition; winter maintenance and emergency response; Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP).

**Principal Risks & Management**

Effect of extreme weather, insufficient funding, rising cost of plant and materials. Investment will be targeted at areas of need in order to reduce risk of not achieving the target. The developing TAMP will contribute to the process.


**BV187a: Condition of footway categories 1,1a and 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Percentage of the footway network where structural maintenance should be considered.

**Data source**
Visual inspection of a sample of footways. Results of surveys in previous years have been variable and an average of the last four years has been adopted as the 2005/06 baseline. A review of the sampling method will be undertaken in order to ensure more consistent and representative results.

**Target**
To maintain the current baseline through to 2010/11. The target may need to be reviewed as more results are obtained and following a review of sampling. The current baseline is taken as the mean of 2002/3 through to 2005/06.

**Evidence**
The target is to maintain the condition generally at existing levels. It is not anticipated that funding will be available to make significant improvements in the overall condition.

**Benchmarking**
Wiltshire has a more stretching target in terms of change and end condition than most of the benchmarked authorities.

**Consultation**
The provisional LTP2 footway condition target was considered “about right”. The provisional LTP2 allocation of £5.4m to walking schemes was, on balance, also considered “about right”, although there was a spread of views on this.

**Review**
A target to stabilise the condition is considered feasible with anticipated spending levels.

**Key Actions**
Routine and structural maintenance in order to keep the network in good condition; winter maintenance and emergency response; Transport Asset Management Plan.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Effect of extreme weather, insufficient funding, rising cost of plant and materials. Funding levels will be reviewed during the LTP2 period in order to determine whether funding is adequate to achieve target.
LTP Objective
P3

Government Priority
Road Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Total killed or seriously injured (KSI). Includes accidents on trunk roads & the M4 motorway.

**Data source**
Police accident records.

**Target**
The trajectory requires an average reduction of 15.5 KSI accidents per year. This is approximately 1.6 times the 1994-2004 rate. Accidents on roads managed by the Highways Agency (forming part of the totals for Wiltshire) have increased during the first LTP period.

The integration of the safety camera activities into the wider road safety delivery process will enable greater flexibility to pursue the mix of road safety measures which make the greatest contribution to reduce road casualties throughout Wiltshire’s local and trunk road network.

The Council currently has a list of 220 accident cluster sites, representing 24% of the accidents on County roads. The funding for Local Safety Schemes (LSS) to tackle these sites is to increase to £450,000 in 2006/07, 2.25 times the allocation for 2005/06. It is proposed to maintain this enhanced investment throughout the period of LTP2. This additional funding will enable more effective solutions at particularly hazardous individual sites, intended to improve the overall 30% reduction in accident rate attributable to LSS.

**Evidence**
The trajectory requires an average reduction of 15.5 KSI accidents per year. This is approximately 1.6 times the 1994-2004 rate. Accidents on roads managed by the Highways Agency (forming part of the totals for Wiltshire) have increased during the first LTP period.

The integration of the safety camera activities into the wider road safety delivery process will enable greater flexibility to pursue the mix of road safety measures which make the greatest contribution to reduce road casualties throughout Wiltshire’s local and trunk road network.

The Council currently has a list of 220 accident cluster sites, representing 24% of the accidents on County roads. The funding for Local Safety Schemes (LSS) to tackle these sites is to increase to £450,000 in 2006/07, 2.25 times the allocation for 2005/06. It is proposed to maintain this enhanced investment throughout the period of LTP2. This additional funding will enable more effective solutions at particularly hazardous individual sites, intended to improve the overall 30% reduction in accident rate attributable to LSS.

**Benchmarking**
Wiltshire’s target is towards the middle of the range of accident reduction rates.

**Consultation**
There was a strong agreement with the proposed target. Road safety was given the highest priority by a large majority. There was support (weak) for spending more than the indicated £830k on Safe Routes to School, and weaker support for increasing spending on Local Safety Schemes above £1650k. Nevertheless, weak support is still support.

**Review**
The 40% target supports the national target and has local consensus. Although not stretching according to the DfT’s LTP2 Guidance, local circumstances make this a challenging target requiring the full support of other partners such as the Highways Agency. The new flexibility of Safety Camera Partnership funding will allow resources to be targeted most effectively.

**Key Actions**
Implementation, review and monitoring of the three Es (Education, Enforcement and Engineering). New and innovative ideas researched and, where appropriate, implemented.

**Principal Risks & Management**
1. The safety of Trunk Roads and the M4 Motorway does not improve.
2. Less funding is available to local authorities and camera partnerships due to the integration of funding for safety cameras in the LTP2.
3. Severe weather conditions result in increased collision problems. The collisions that occur throughout the County are closely monitored and the data analysed. A change in the rate of casualty reduction would be detected, the problem identified and the Road Safety Strategy adjusted accordingly.
**BV99y: Children killed or seriously injured (including trunk roads and motorway)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (3 yr mean)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Children under 16 years killed or seriously injured (KSI) according to police records. Average of most recent three years.

**Data source**
Police accident records.

**Target**
To achieve a 50% reduction in 2010 below the 1994-1998 mean used as a baseline. Due to unpredictable variability in the yearly outcome, even with the underlying progress being “on track”, 20% of annual results can be expected to be outside the target band.

**Evidence**
The long term trend is on-track. It is proposed to continue the existing safety strategy, upon which a continued accident reduction trend is assumed (see Principal Risks below).

**Benchmarking**
Although Wiltshire is currently ahead of the trajectory shown, the rate of reduction in casualties for the LTP2 period is comparable with benchmarked authorities.

**Consultation**
There was a strong measure of agreement with the proposed target. Road safety was given the highest priority by a large majority. There is support (weak) for spending more than the indicated £830k on Safe Routes to School, and weaker support for increasing spending on Local Safety Schemes above £1650k. Nevertheless, weak support is still support.

**Review**
In the provisional LTP2 this target was suggested as a possible candidate for a more stretching target. However, performance management utilising statistics based on such small numbers is problematical, so the preference is to concentrate on the KSI (all ages) target, with the child indicator retaining its original target.

**Key Actions**
Implementation, review and monitoring of the three Es (Education, Enforcement and Engineering). New and innovative ideas researched and, where appropriate, implemented.

Of particular importance to child safety is the “Walk Safe Pedestrian Programme” developed by the County’s Road Safety Officers to help primary school children to develop the skills required to deal with traffic as pedestrians. Since its introduction in March 2004, over 20,000 children have been trained.

**Principal Risks & Management**
1. Difficulty in positively affecting the small numbers of accidents.
2. Changes in accident trends through unexpected external influences.

Each year the County Council undertakes a child safety audit when the details of all injury collisions involving children are analysed. Any problem areas would be identified and consideration given to the appropriate remedial action to sustain the casualty reduction.
CHAPTER 15

TARGETS AND INDICATORS

BV99z: Slight casualties (including trunk roads and motorway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Total of slight casualties according to police records. Includes accidents on trunk roads and the M4 motorway.

**Target**
Casualties in 2010 to be 12% less than the 1994-1998 mean.

**Evidence**
The proposed 12% reduction reflects the long-term trend (since 1994). If the recent upward trend is more than a random deviation then performance in the LTP2 period will have to be improved. The integration of the safety camera activities into the wider road safety delivery process will enable greater flexibility to pursue the mix of road safety measures which make the greatest contribution to reduce road casualties throughout Wiltshire’s local and trunk road network. The increased investment in Local Safety Schemes (see indicator BV99x) should result in further reduction in slight casualties which account for almost 80% of Wiltshire’s casualties.

**Benchmarking**
The provisional LTP2 Wiltshire target of a 10% reduction from the 1994-1998 mean was less demanding (in terms of change over the LTP2 period) than most of the benchmarked authority targets.

**Consultation**
Road safety was the highest priority. Support for spending more than the amount indicated in the provisional LTP2 on Local Safety Schemes was weak. Advice from GOSW was that a more stretching target was desirable.

**Review**
Considering benchmarking and advice from GOSW, the target has been stretched from a 10% reduction to a 12% reduction.

**Key Actions**
Implementation, review and monitoring of the three Es (Education, Enforcement and Engineering). New and innovative ideas researched and, where appropriate, implemented.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Increase in accidents on roads controlled by the Highways Agency and the uncertain scope for influencing the future accident performance on these roads. The collisions that occur throughout the County are closely monitored and analysed. A change in the rate of slight collision reduction would be detected, problem identified and the Road Safety Strategy adjusted accordingly.
### Target: Bus Patronage

**LTP Objective**
- P6

**Government Priority**
- Congestion, Accessibility, Sustainable Communities

#### Yearly Targets and Actuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual (millions)</td>
<td>8.762</td>
<td>9.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definition
- Annual total number of single journeys on registered bus services.

#### Data source
- Bus operator ticketing data.

#### Target
- A 5.6% increase over the 2004/05 baseline to 9.820 million journeys in 2010/11. The trajectory rises in 2006-2008 to reflect the impact of free OAP fares, then declines on the assumption that additional revenue funding cannot be found to meet continuing above-inflation transport contract costs and to replace reductions in the level of commercial service provision – these are expected to outweigh the positive impact of the LTP2 programme.

#### Evidence
- A review of prospects for various service groups has produced the following assessment:
  - There will be a continued underlying decline in bus use of 1% per annum resulting from increased car ownership.
  - This will be exacerbated by the effects of funding limitations and further reductions in commercially operated services (estimated loss of 665,000 passengers per annum by 2010-11).
  - Free OAP fares will bring an additional 829,000 passengers p.a. by 2010-11.
  - Kickstart funding for service 55 will add 121,000 passengers p.a. by 2010-11.
  - The actions proposed in the LTP2 strategy will generate an additional 828,000 passengers per annum by 2010-11.

#### Benchmarking
- Most of the benchmarked authorities set a target for greater growth, and Wiltshire was in the lower quartile on its provisional LTP2 target. The revised target takes it out of this band.

#### Consultation
- Approximately equal numbers of respondents considered a 3.6% increase to be “too easy” or “about right” (the target has since been increased slightly to reflect the impact of free OAP fares and other factors).

#### Review
- There are still significant risks and uncertainties that could result in the need to revise the target in future years.

#### Key Actions
- Free OAP fares. Quality Partnerships and other joint initiatives with operators on commercial services (including Kickstart bids). Revenue funding for non-commercial services; Key bus route and interchange improvements; Punctuality Improvement Partnerships; improved information; completion of Park & Ride in Salisbury. The County Council intends – subject to the outcome of the annual funding settlement – to continue to spend at or above the county average per head on public transport support.

#### Principal Risks & Management
- Inability to continue absorbing the impact of above-inflation transport cost increases or reductions in commercial bus services, or to replace Government Challenge funding when it expires; above-inflation increases in commercial bus fares; uncertain impact of free OAP fares; uncertain impact of LTP interventions and Kickstart on patronage; funding pressures on Council budgets increase and / or annual revenue funding settlement is lower than anticipated, requiring Council to cut expenditure; motoring costs falling relative to bus.
- There are few actions that could realistically be taken to mitigate most of the above risks, but trends will be monitored, possible interventions identified, and targets adjusted.
**BV104: Percentage of survey respondents satisfied with local bus services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Proportion of all respondents (not just bus users) satisfied with local bus services.

**Evidence**
The Passenger Transport Best Value Review focussed on understanding the factors driving satisfaction. Stakeholders considered that the increase in satisfaction noted in 2000-2003 was due to improved vehicles and infrastructure on the ‘key network’ and in Salisbury city, promotional activities, and relative stability of the network. The factors considered to contribute most to a further increase in satisfaction were lower fares, more reliable and punctual services, better evening / Sunday bus services, and better publicity and marketing. Some of the main drivers of satisfaction are either not within the control of the Council (notably fares on commercial bus services) or would require additional funding which is unlikely to be available. However, a provisional LTP2 target to achieve an increased satisfaction rating of 75% or more by 2009 was set based on the review Implementation Plan, dependent in part on a bid for additional funding. Due to the poor financial settlement received by the Council for 2006-07 this bid was unsuccessful, so the target has been revised downwards. It appears likely that the revenue funding situation will deteriorate, and this is likely to result in service reductions which impact on satisfaction. Commercial bus fares are also likely to continue rising in real terms. Against this, it is anticipated that further improvements on the key network and in Salisbury will result in some increase in satisfaction.

**Benchmarking**
Wiltshire’s original target was within the band of benchmarked authorities.

**Consultation**
The dominant response was that the original target was “about right”.

**Review**
Given the increasing pressures on revenue funding and the likelihood that fares on commercial services will continue to increase in real terms, it is considered that the revised (lower) target is more realistic than that published in the provisional LTP2.

**Key Actions**
Revenue funding to maintain bus services. ‘Kickstart’ initiatives and Quality Partnerships with operators to improve commercial services. Punctuality Improvement Partnerships with operators. Encouraging targeted fare discounts linked to marketing initiatives. Free OAP fares from April 2006. Assessing feasibility of countywide young persons off-peak fare discount scheme. Encourage ticket inter-availability. Continue improvements to infrastructure on Key Bus Route Network. Improving quality and availability of bus service information.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Incorrect assumptions on the impact of the various factors affecting satisfaction. Possible negative impact of any ‘bad news’ media coverage about public transport in the period immediately preceding the survey. Increasing pressure on Council revenue budgets leading to greater than anticipated service reductions; continuing increases in transport operating costs limiting ability of operators to maintain and / or invest in services in Wiltshire. Results bias due to possible enforced changes in survey methodology (from face-to-face survey in 2003 to postal survey in 2006 / 2009). Seek to mitigate the above by managing expectations, and by promotion of improvements.
### LD1: Devizes urban traffic

#### LTP Objective

P11, S1, S6, S11

#### Government Priority

Air Quality, Congestion, Quality of Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Index of traffic across town screenline 07:00-19:00.

**Data source**

Manual screen line count.

**Target**

The first LTP target of restricting traffic growth to 14% between 2001 and 2011 will be retained, but rebased to 2003. This target will be subject to review when the revision of the Devizes traffic model is complete, taking into account additional housing provision.

**Evidence**

The target is based on the traffic model developed when the first LTP was prepared.

**Benchmarking**

No benchmark for an appropriately sized town was available.

**Consultation**

Consultation on the Devizes Transport Strategy was undertaken for the first LTP. The target has not been changed.

**Review**

It is anticipated that the target will be reviewed during the LTP2 period, with modelling being updated to account for actual and anticipated housing completions.

**Key Actions**

Devizes Community Area Transport Strategy. Development of district-wide parking strategy; implementation of pedestrian and cycling networks; Public Transport Strategy

**Principal Risks & Management**

Unexpected changes in travel patterns. Higher housing/employment imbalance. The appropriate strategy will involve obtaining the commitment of the District Council and other partners at an early stage.
LS1: Traffic across Salisbury central cordon

**Target**

To reduce the absolute level of traffic entering the city centre by 9.5% in 2011, compared with the 2003 baseline. This target is carried forward from the first LTP (but with the baseline year changed from 1999 to 2003).

**Evidence**

The target is based on the projections of the Salisbury Transport Model. The trajectory takes account of the opening schedule for Park & Ride sites and the gradual implementation of parking policy changes that cannot occur until most or all Park &Ride sites are operational.

**Benchmarking**

The fall in traffic specified exceeds expectations from other benchmarked authorities.

**Consultation**

The Salisbury Transport Strategy followed consultation prior to its adoption for the first LTP period. Outcomes predicted by the modelling were included in the consultation.

**Review**

The target has not been changed from LTP1, but the trajectory has been altered to reflect the anticipated opening date of Park & Ride sites. The target is based on the Salisbury Transport Plan as accepted, and it is not intended to ease the target unless factors intervene that are outside the control of the Council and its partner authorities. The rise in traffic recorded in 2005 is unexpected, and a detailed assessment of the operation of the recently-introduced UTMC system may be required. The robustness of the indicator may be improved during the early part of the LTP2 period, in which case indicator values may be revised without affecting the challenge of the target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Index of motor traffic across city centre cordon 07:00-19:00.

**Data source**

Manual cordon count.

**Key Actions**

Park & Ride sites at London Road and Petersfinger. Complete implementation of Parking Strategy. Measures to increase walking, cycling and use of public transport. ITS Strategy.

**Principal Risks & Management**

Protracted statutory procedures for establishing Park & Ride sites. Opposition to Parking Strategy. Significant reductions in train services. Uncertainty in modelling of pedestrian and cycling activity. Pre-emptive risk management will include communicating with partner bodies to emphasise the link between the strategy issues and achieving desirable outcomes. Close monitoring will identify where action needs to be strengthened.

**Government Priority**

Air Quality, Congestion, Quality of Public Spaces

**LTP Objective**

P11, P12, S1, S6, S11

---
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**LW1: Urban traffic in WWSTS area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>104.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Urban traffic in the Western Wiltshire Sustainable Transport Strategy area. Index of traffic across town screenlines 07:00-19:00. Towns included are Chippenham, Corsham, Trowbridge and Westbury.

**Data source**
Manual cordon counts.

**Target**
To limit the increase in traffic measured in the towns to less than 9% between 2001 and 2011. This target is retained from the first LTP, but is re-based to 2003.

**Evidence**
The target was developed for the first LTP using a SATURN/SATCHMO transport model.

**Benchmarking**
The target is within the range seen in provisional LTPs of other authorities.

**Consultation**
Consultation on the WWSTS was undertaken for the first LTP.

**Review**
This indicator forms a proxy for minimising adverse effects of traffic, including congestion. The trend since 2002 suggests that the target is sufficiently challenging.

**Key Actions**
Measures to increase walking, cycling and use of public transport – land-use policies.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Continuing increase in cost of public transport relative to the car. Insufficient investment in removing capacity constraints on the rail network and contraction of services from smaller stations. Changes in employment patterns leading to higher housing/employment imbalance. Pre-emptive risk management will include communicating with partner bodies to emphasise the link between the strategy issues and achieving desirable outcomes. Close monitoring will identify where action needs to be strengthened.
### LD2: Inter-urban traffic in Devizes Community Area

**Definition**
Indexed sum of traffic flow (AADT) at Automatic count sites within Devizes Community Area.

**Data source**
Automatic traffic counters. Four one-week counts per year.

**Target**
To reduce the growth in traffic flow to a 12.9% increase by 2011 from the new 2003 baseline, equivalent to 17% above the 1999 baseline used for the first LTP target.

**Evidence**
The target is continued from the first LTP. Progress so far is satisfactory.

**Benchmarking**
The target is within the range seen in other provisional LTPs.

**Consultation**
There was a balanced opinion on the countywide target of a 13% increase.

**Review**
There is currently no evidence to support a change in the target. A review may be necessary during the LTP2 period, for example to reflect the Regional Spatial Strategy and its bearing on Swindon.

**Key Actions**
Land-use policy; Public Transport Strategy, particularly the Key Bus Route Network.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Possible higher housing/employment imbalance. Changes in real motoring costs. Progress will be reviewed, and factors over which the County has influence identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>101.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LTP Objective**
P2, P11, S4, S6, S7, S11

**Government Priority**
Congestion, Climate Change
### LS2: Inter-urban traffic in Salisbury area

**Definition**
Indexed aggregate of traffic flow at Automatic count sites, predominantly on radial routes around Salisbury, taking 1999 as 100.

**Data source**
Automatic traffic counters. Four one-week counts per year.

**Target**
To reduce the growth in traffic flow to 10% above the former 1999 baseline in 2011.

**Evidence**
This target level is derived from modelling work and retained from the first LTP, with re-basing to 2003.

**Benchmarking**
The target is within the range seen in other provisional LTPs.

**Consultation**
There was a balanced opinion on the countywide target of a 13% increase.

**Review**
Progress so far has been very satisfactory. No change to the target has been proposed.

**Key Actions**
Land-use policy; Public Transport Strategy, including Key Bus Route Network enhancement and rail elements.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Changes in real motoring costs, particularly relative to public transport. Insufficient investment in removing capacity constraints on the rail network and contraction of services. Higher housing/employment imbalance.

The target will be reviewed following a major change in external factors – the strategy used by the Council (e.g. land-use planning) can react only slowly to changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LTP Objective**
P2, P11, P12, S4, S6, S7, S11

**Government Priority**
Congestion, Climate Change
LW2: Inter-urban traffic in WWSTS area

**Definition**
Indexed aggregate of traffic flow at Automatic count sites (AADT), predominantly on inter-urban routes within the Western Wiltshire Sustainable Transport Strategy Area. Year 2003 is taken as index=100.

**Data source**
Automatic traffic counters; four one-week counts per year.

**Target**
To reduce the growth in traffic flow to 10% above the former 1999 baseline in 2011.

**Evidence**
This target level is derived from modelling work and retained from the first LTP, but has been rebased to 2003. Traffic growth in the area has increased since 2001.

**Benchmarking**
The target is within the range seen in other provisional LTPs.

**Consultation**
There was a balanced opinion on the countywide target of a 13% increase.

**Review**
On recent trends, the target allows no room for complacency.

**Key Actions**
Land-use policy; Public Transport Strategy, including Key Bus Route Network enhancements and rail elements.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Changes in real motoring costs, particularly relative to public transport. Insufficient investment in removing capacity constraints on the rail network and contraction of services. Higher housing/employment imbalance. The target will be reviewed following a major change in external factors – the strategy used by the Council (e.g. land-use planning) can react only slowly to changes.

**Year** | **2003** | **2004** | **2005** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Target** | 100 | 100 | 102.3 | 103.3 | 104.2 | 105.1 | 106.0 | 107.0 | 107.9
**Actual** | 100 | 101.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
LR2: Inter-urban traffic flow in non-strategy areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Indexed aggregate of traffic flow at Automatic count sites, predominantly on inter-urban non-trunk routes outside the Devizes / Western Wiltshire / Salisbury areas. Year 2003 is taken as index=100.

**Data source**
Automatic traffic counters; four one-week counts per year.

**Target**
To restrain the growth in traffic flow to no more than NRTF low growth by 2011 (adjusted for local conditions using National Trip End Model factors) compared with the 2003 baseline.

**Evidence**
This target is continued from the first LTP, and is based on NRTF low-growth forecasts. The target is for slightly lower growth than the core indicator LTP2 (Countywide vehicle-km) partly because target LR2 is not sensitive to changes in total road length, and partly because it excludes trunk roads (on which growth tends to be higher).

**Benchmarking**
The target was towards the high-end when compared with other authorities for which a target had been specified. This is considered appropriate for the parts of the County with no area strategy focus.

**Consultation**
There was a balanced opinion on the countywide target of a 13% increase by 2010.

**Review**
Although two further areas of the County which are included within the scope of this indicator have acquired their own area strategy, no change to the indicator is proposed.

**Key Actions**
Land-use policy; Travelwise initiatives (school and employer); Key Bus Route Network infrastructure.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Changes in real motoring costs, particularly relative to public transport. Insufficient investment in removing capacity constraints on the rail network and contraction of services. Higher housing/employment imbalance. The target will be reviewed following a major change in external factors – the strategy used by the Council (e.g. land-use planning) can react only slowly to changes.
**LD3: Cycling in Devizes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Index of cycle counts at 10 sites in Devizes, 07:30-10:30. Year 2003 taken as 100.

**Data source**

Manual counts three times each year. A three year rolling mean is used.

**Target**

Count in 2010 to be 2% higher than the 2003 baseline. The trajectory will be level until 2007 and then rise with an increasing gradient (for an explanation, see area-wide cycling indicator, LTP3). A rolling average is used in order to reduce the effect of day-to-day variability upon the indicator. Therefore the 2% target increase for the single year 2010 is represented by a 0.81% increase in the rolling mean.

**Evidence**

Several significant lengths of cycle route for Devizes are planned for implementation during the LTP2 period.

**Benchmarking**

Of 11 authorities compared, two had targets for no growth, three had targets up to 10% and the remainder were for higher growth.

**Consultation**

Few respondents thought that the 2% increase proposed in the provisional LTP2 was “too hard”. Those responding that it was “too easy” marginally outnumbered respondents who thought the target was “about right”.

**Review**

Evidence linking cycle infrastructure improvements with progress towards the priority objectives is not particularly strong, leading to difficulty in justifying schemes to elected members. Considering the declining indicator trend noted until recently, the given target represents a challenge. The improvement seen in 2005 is cautiously welcomed, and the target will be reviewed if evidence of sustained progress is obtained. The indicator itself will be reviewed to allow the inclusion of further data sources when available.

**Key Actions**

Examination of the efficacy of various cycling measures in the Wiltshire Cycle Action Plan will be used to achieve better results later in the LTP2 period. Expenditure on cycling will be higher than for the first LTP period. New (and existing) infrastructure will be promoted through coordination with Travelwise.

**Principal Risks & Management**

The strengths of various factors restraining cycle use (for example, parents’ safety concerns) are currently unquantified. The sampling error of the indicator and yearly variation in actual cycling levels (e.g. due to weather patterns) hinders regular review of progress. A review of the Cycle Action Plan will strengthen the evidence base. Incremental improvements to the monitoring will be sought. The progressive accumulation of data will allow further analysis of local factors affecting cycling.

**LTP Objective**

P2, P8, S1

**Government Priority**

Congestion, Accessibility, Air Quality, Healthy Communities, Sustainable Communities
LS3: Cycling in Salisbury

**Definition**
Index of cycle counts crossing the Salisbury city centre cordon (10 sites), 07:30-10:30. Year 2003 taken as 100.

**Data source**
Manual cordon counts on three days per year per site.

**Target**
Annual count in 2010 to be 2% higher than the 2003 baseline. Progress is anticipated to be concentrated in the final three years. The indicator used is a three-year rolling mean, for which the 2% target increase leads to the trajectory shown, with the figure for 2010 being the mean of the 2008-2010 anticipated single-year values of 99.5, 100.7 and 102.0.

**Evidence**
The increase in 2005 cannot in isolation be considered robust enough evidence of the reversal of a declining trend.

**Benchmarking**
Of 11 authorities compared, two had targets for no growth, three had targets up to 10% and the remainder were for higher growth.

**Consultation**
Few respondents thought that the 2% increase proposed in the provisional LTP2 was “too hard”. Those responding that it was “too easy” marginally outnumbered respondents who thought the target was “about right”.

**Review**
Evidence linking cycle infrastructure improvements with progress towards the priority objectives is not particularly strong, leading to difficulty in justifying schemes to elected members. Considering the declining indicator trend noted until recently, the given target represents a challenge. The improvement seen in 2005 is cautiously welcomed, and the target will be reviewed if evidence of sustained progress is obtained. The indicator itself will be reviewed to allow the inclusion of further data sources when available. While spending on cycling during the period of this LTP will be high, the thrust will be on the improvement of walking, which is reflected in the targets.

**Key Actions**
Examination of the efficacy of various cycling measures in the Wiltshire Cycle Action Plan will be used to achieve better results later in the LTP2 period. Expenditure on cycling will be higher than for the first LTP period. New (and existing) infrastructure will be promoted through coordination with Travelwise.

**Principal Risks & Management**
The strengths of various factors restraining cycle use (for example, parents’ safety concerns) are currently unquantified. The sampling error of the indicator and yearly variation in actual cycling levels (e.g. due to weather patterns) hinders regular review of progress. A review of the Cycle Action Plan will strengthen the evidence base. Incremental improvements to the monitoring will be sought. The progressive accumulation of data will allow further analysis of local factors affecting cycling.
### LW3: Cycling in WWSTS area

#### Target (3 yr mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target (3 yr mean)</th>
<th>Actual (3 yr mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definition
Index of cycle counts crossing the town screenlines, 07:30-10:30. Year 2003 taken as 100. The towns counted are: Calne, Chippenham, Corsham, Melsham, Trowbridge, Westbury, and Wootton Bassett.

#### Data source
Manual cycle screenline counts, generally 3 times per year per site.

#### Target
Cycling in 2010 to be 2% higher than the 2003 baseline. The trajectory is based on an unchanged level of cycling to 2007, with an increase from then until 2010 for which year the target is 2% above baseline. The use of a rolling mean for the indicator, taken with the progress outlined, results in the trajectory shown in the chart and table above. For example, the single-year index in years 2008-2010 is 98.9, 100.4 and 102, leading to the 2010 three-year-mean of 100.4

#### Evidence
Considering the declining trend noted until recently, a modest target is appropriate.

#### Benchmarking
Of 11 authorities compared, two had targets for no growth, three had targets up to 10% and the remainder were for higher growth.

#### Consultation
Few respondents thought that the 2% increase proposed in the provisional LTP2 was “too hard”. Those responding that it was “too easy” marginally outnumbered respondents who thought the target was “about right”.

#### Review
Evidence linking cycle infrastructure improvements with progress towards the priority objectives is not particularly strong, leading to difficulty in justifying schemes to elected members. Considering the declining indicator trend noted until recently, the given target represents a challenge. The indicator will be reviewed to allow the inclusion of further data sources when available.

#### Key Actions
Examination of the efficacy of various cycling measures in the Wiltshire Cycle Action Plan will be used to achieve better results later in the LTP2 period. Expenditure on cycling will be higher than for the first LTP period. New (and existing) infrastructure will be promoted through coordination with Travelwise.

#### Principal Risks & Management
The strengths of various factors restraining cycle use (for example, parents’ safety concerns) are currently unquantified. The sampling error of the indicator and yearly variation in actual cycling levels (e.g., due to weather patterns) hinders regular review of progress. A review of the Cycle Action Plan will strengthen the evidence base. Incremental improvements to the monitoring will be sought. The progressive accumulation of data will allow further analysis of local factors affecting cycling.

#### Government Priority
Congestion, Accessibility, Air Quality, Healthy Communities, Sustainable Communities
LD4: Walking in Devizes

**LTP Objective**

P2, S1

**Government Priority**

Congestion, Accessibility, Air Quality, Healthy Communities, Sustainable Communities, Quality of Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Index of aggregated pedestrian counts taken at 10 sites in Devizes, 07:30-10:30.

**Data source**

Manual screenline counts on three days per site.

**Target**

To increase pedestrian flows by 20% in 2010, compared with 2003 (this is a rebased version of the target used for the first LTP period to increase pedestrian flows by 30% in 2010, compared with 2001). A three-year rolling mean is used, and this in 2010 should be at least 17.4% above the 2003 baseline assuming the trajectory shown is followed.

**Evidence**

Part of the increase is due to anticipated population growth.

**Benchmarking**

Other authorities had provisional LTP2 increases in the 9%-20% range.

**Consultation**

The provisional LTP2 programme for pedestrian schemes and for road crossings was considered “about right”. There was support for higher spending on Safe Routes to School.

**Review**

The recent trend has been favourable and is sufficient to achieve the target.

**Key Actions**

Devizes Community Area Transport Strategy including walking route improvements; Travelwise initiatives.

**Principal Risks & Management**

Effectiveness of measures uncertain; schemes rejected in consultation, particularly a resistance to the “urbanisation” of areas with rural character. This could lead to a disjointed network which could hinder progress to achieve the target. The amount of scheme monitoring will be increased. Evidence from outside the County will be sought, including solutions that preserve the visual character of the area.
### LS4: Walking in Salisbury

**Walking count indexed to 2003 mean for 3 years to 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>119.9</td>
<td>126.6</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definiition**: Index of aggregated pedestrian counts crossing the city centre cordon, 07:30-10:30.

**Data source**: Manual cordon counts on three days per year per site.

**Target**: To increase pedestrian flows by 40% above the 2003 baseline in 2010 (this is derived from the first LTP target to increase pedestrian flows by 50% in 2010, compared with 2001). A three-year rolling average is used to reduce the effect of day-to-day variability in walking counts. As the figure reported in 2010 will be the 2008-2010 mean, the target for the rolling average is 133.3, assuming the trajectory shown.

**Evidence**: The target was derived from the Salisbury Transport Model.

**Benchmarking**: Other authorities had provisional LTP2 increases in the 9%-20% range.

**Consultation**: The provisional LTP2 programme for pedestrian schemes and for road crossings was considered “about right”. There was support for higher spending on Safe Routes to School.

**Review**: Compared with past performance, and with benchmarked authorities, the target is very ambitious. It reflects the focus on this mode now that the majority of the Park & Ride schemes are implemented.

**Key Actions**: Salisbury Transport Plan, including walking improvements, traffic management and Parking Strategy. Travelwise initiatives (school and employer).

**Principal Risks & Management**: Effectiveness of measures uncertain. The amount of scheme monitoring will be increased. Evidence from outside the County will be sought.
**LW4: Walking in WWSTS towns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>124.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (3 yr mean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Index of pedestrian counts crossing the town screenlines 07:30-10:30. Year 2003 taken as 100. The towns counted are: Calne, Chippenham, Corsham, Melksham, Trowbridge, Westbury, and Wootton Bassett.

**Data source**

Manual screen line counts.

**Target**

The first LTP target to increase pedestrian flows by 30% in 2010, compared with 2001 is rebased as a 31% increase from 2003. A three-year mean is used to reduce the effect of sampling variability on the indicator. As the figure reported in 2010 will be the 2008-2010 mean, the target for the rolling average is 124.6, assuming the trajectory shown.

**Evidence**

Forecast population growth should provide part of the increase, although the trend since 2001 suggests that other factors are counteracting this. The nature of proposed developments, such as the increased emphasis on town centres (including residential development) and upon developments such as ‘Vision for Trowbridge’, should benefit walking. There is significant funding during the LTP2 period for schemes to improve the walking environment.

**Benchmarking**

Other authorities had provisional LTP2 increases in the 9%-20% range, 9%

**Consultation**

The provisional LTP2 programme for pedestrian schemes and for road crossings was considered “about right”. There was support for higher spending on Safe Routes to School.

**Review**

Judged against the recent performance of the indicator and with benchmarked authorities, the target is very stretching.

**Key Actions**

Appropriate land-use planning, including the redevelopment of brownfield sites. Improving the quality of provision for pedestrians. Travelwise initiatives.

**Principal Risks & Management**

Effectiveness of measures uncertain. The amount of scheme monitoring will be increased. Evidence from outside the County will be sought.

**LTP Objective**

P2, S1

**Government Priority**

Congestion, Accessibility Air Quality, Healthy Communities, Sustainable Communities, Quality of Public Spaces
Target: A 19.8% increase in passenger numbers in 2010 compared with the 2003 baseline.

Evidence: The original target from the first LTP was being closely tracked by actual growth to 2005. This trend was taken as the starting point for a review. The anticipated service level for the new Greater Western and South Western franchises was assessed and adjustments made to the expected flow from individual stations. A further adjustment was made to reflect the change in fares policy to RPI+1. The figure for 2010 includes a small reduction attributed to the effects of overcrowding on some peak time trains. The overall effect of these changes is a reduction of 11 percentage points in the target growth.

Benchmarking: Few authorities were setting a target for more than 3% per annum growth. Wiltshire’s target remains at the high end of the range.

Consultation: The majority of respondents thought that the provisional LTP2 target of a 30.5% increase was “about right”. There was high support for increasing the spending focus on public transport interchanges.

Review: Passenger use of Wiltshire stations exhibits a mixed-purpose characteristic, suggesting that there is ample scope for increasing off peak flows (and therefore improving the financial performance of the railway). Unfortunately, the current DfT policy focus is expected to result in significant reduction to off-peak service levels. Evidence (see TRL report 593) suggests that rail travel around smaller towns will be particularly sensitive to fare increases. By inference, this will also apply to other perceived ‘generalised cost’ increases such as frequency reductions.

On the other hand, the rail network in Wiltshire serves or connects regionally significant cities and towns at which the RSS concentrates growth. These include Swindon, Chippenham, Trowbridge, Salisbury, Bath and Bristol. Opportunities are identified for interchange improvements, with Trowbridge, Westbury and Salisbury being likely candidates.

Key Actions: Improving access to stations, including walking / cycling routes and integration with other modes of transport. Promotion, including employer travel plans. Continuing development of town centres, providing residential and employment use and enhancing the relative attractiveness of towns served by rail.

Engagement with DfT and rail industry to ensure service continuity and incremental capacity improvements.

Principal Risks & Management: Service reductions. Capacity constraints being unresolved.

Anticipated risks have been factored into the target. The Council will promote an evidence-supported case for improvement of train services serving the county.
L10: Cycle Schemes Completed

**Target**

- **LTP Objective**: P2, P3, P4, P8
- **Government Priority**: Accessibility, Air Quality, Congestion, Road Safety, Quality of Public Spaces, Healthy Communities

**Year** | **Target** | **Actual**
--- | --- | ---
2003/04 | 0 | 1
2004/05 | 14 | 4
2005/06 | 21 | 1
2006/07 | 27 | 6
2007/08 | 35 | 43
2008/09 | 43 | 51
2009/10 | 51 | 51
2010/11 | 51 | 51

**Definition**

Number of cycle infrastructure schemes completed since April 2004, measured at end of financial year. Schemes such as cycle parking are excluded.

**Data source**

County Council records.

**Target**

To complete 51 schemes between April 2004 and April 2011.

**Evidence**

Progress toward the objective of completing the town cycle networks is constrained by the available funding and by the performance of the authority in delivering schemes. The trajectory for 2006/07 and 2007/08 is based upon a programme of schemes in development, while beyond this date, the number of schemes is based upon provisional levels of spending.

**Benchmarking**

No suitable benchmarking was contained in provisional LTP2s for other shire authorities.

**Consultation**

There was a small balance in favour of the assertion that the provisional LTP2 funding allocation of £2.539m to cycling schemes was “too high”.

**Review**

The former indicator (proportion of cycle networks completed) was becoming difficult to interpret due to ongoing revisions to the town network plans, for example, to serve new developments. The replacement indicator, while simple, is focussed on stretching the ability of the authority to deliver improvements. The revised spending allocation of £1.956m reflects the consultation process and an assessment of the capacity to deliver schemes.

**Key Actions**

Programming of design and consultation to ensure a supply of schemes for implementation.

**Principal Risks & Management**

Protracted statutory procedures (including land acquisition) that are expensive in relation to the benefits of typical cycle schemes; schemes rejected in consultation; a small reserve of designed schemes will be used to allow implementation to occur to the full extent of the available funding allocation.
CHAPTER 15

TARGETS AND INDICATORS

L16: Cyclist Casualties (All Severities)

**LTP Objective**

P4

**Government Priority**

Road Safety – especially vulnerable users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual (3 yr mean)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Cyclists killed or injured on public roads within the administrative County of Wiltshire, from police records. A three-year rolling mean will be used as the indicator. Trunk roads and the M4 motorway are included.

**Data source**

Police records.

**Target**

No target is set for this indicator.

**Evidence**

Not required as no target set.

**Benchmarking**

Authorities with a specific cyclist casualty target set this in line with overall casualty reduction targets.

**Consultation**

The overall safety targets were strongly supported. There was no consultation specific to this indicator.

**Review**

Road safety objectives are incentivised through the overall casualty indicators. Monitoring of cycle casualties is being published through the LTP2 process to demonstrate that the Council is aware of vulnerable road users and will take action if unforeseen circumstances lead to a deterioration in the favourable trend shown.

**Key Actions**

Implementation, review and monitoring of the three Es (Education, Enforcement and Engineering). New and innovative ideas researched and, where appropriate, implemented.

**Principal Risks & Management**

Increased numbers cycling (but below the critical threshold where improved prominence yields a safety improvement).
**L17: Pedestrian Casualties (All Severities)**

**LTP Objective**

P4

**Government Priority**

Road Safety – especially vulnerable users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Pedestrians killed or injured on public roads within the administrative County of Wiltshire, from police records. A three-year rolling mean will be used as the indicator. Trunk roads and the M4 motorway are included.

**Data source**

Police records.

**Target**

No target is set for this indicator.

**Evidence**

Not required as no target set.

**Benchmarking**

Authorities with a specific cyclist casualty target set this in line with overall casualty reduction targets.

**Consultation**

The overall safety targets were strongly supported. There was no consultation specific to this indicator.

**Review**

Road safety objectives are incentivised through the overall casualty indicators. Monitoring of cycle casualties is being published through the LTP2 process to demonstrate that the Council is aware of vulnerable road users and will take action if unforeseen circumstances lead to a deterioration in the favourable trend shown.

**Key Actions**

Implementation, review and monitoring of the three Es (Education, Enforcement and Engineering). New and innovative ideas researched and, where appropriate, implemented.

**Principal Risks & Management**

Increased numbers walking.
### L23: Proportion of bus routes operated by low-floor vehicles

**LTP Objective**

P1

**Government Priority**

Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Proportion of bus routes operated entirely by low-floor vehicles. The indicator is independent of infrastructure provisions such as raised kerbs.

**Data source**

Operator information and observation.

**Target**

To achieve 25% in 2010/11, from a baseline of 8% in 2003/04. The trajectory is non-linear to reflect the increasing influence of vehicle accessibility regulations and the completion of partially low-floor routes through the progressive introduction of new vehicles.

**Evidence**

Operators are increasingly willing to introduce low floor buses on their core routes, but find it more difficult to develop a strong business case for investment on less strongly performing services. Experience of inviting tenders with a ‘low floor option’ on supported services over several years has shown that, on most services, it would not be affordable to introduce a requirement for low floor buses. A pragmatic approach has therefore been adopted of making improvements where affordable. Although the Disability Regulations will require all buses to be low floor by around 2017 (depending on type), it is unlikely that many of the more rural services in the County will become low floor operated until after 2010-11.

**Benchmarking**

The baseline position is similar to other South West shire authorities. Because the indicator measures routes operated entirely by low-floor buses, it is not directly comparable with other authorities’ indicators based on the proportion of low-floor buses.

**Consultation**

Disabled groups continue to urge for early adoption of low floor buses on all routes.

**Review**

The target is considered to be realistic given the evidence above.

**Key Actions**

Quality Partnerships on commercial services, with Council investment in raised boarders at stops and improved shelters to encourage and complement operator investment in low floor vehicles. Kick Start bids as opportunity arises. Continue to invite tenders including a low floor option on supported services, and provide funding for low floor buses where affordable taking into account other priorities. Include a requirement for low floor buses on tenders for routes where already provided, to avoid reversion once a route is converted.

**Principal Risks & Management**

Slower than forecast investment in new buses by bus operators; continuing contract price increases reducing Council funding for quality improvements.

There is little action (other than that already proposed) that the Council could take to promote faster investment by operators – except to directly fund new vehicles, which is considered a lower priority than continuing with the programme of Key Bus Route Network infrastructure improvements and maintaining bus service frequency and coverage.
Defininition
Journey time reliability on the A350 between its junctions with the M4 and A36 (proxy). Due to the unavailability of vehicle tracking data for this route, a proxy indicator is substituted. This takes two parts: t) Journey time excess (as higher congestion leads to less stable flows and journey times) w) Multiple road works indicator (concurrent works leading to particularly extended journey times) – see next table.

Data source
In-vehicle journey time surveys on days with an unexceptional extent of road works. These are compared with a standard “free flow” journey time obtained when traffic is minimal.

Target
The underlying target is for journey time reliability to improve by 2010. For this part of the proxy, the target is for the excess journey time to return to baseline level by 2010.

Evidence
Apart from resulting in slower journeys, increasing congestion will tend to result in more unpredictable journey times. Given a return to baseline levels of congestion in 2010, improved journey time reliability will be indicated by the improvement in the management of road works – see next table.

Benchmarking
Suitable benchmarking data was not available

Consultation
Following consultation, journey time reliability was identified as an appropriate indicator in the first LTP.

Review
Improving journey time reliability on the A350 is a core element of the Western Wiltshire Sustainable Transport Strategy. A preliminary assessment of link speed data from vehicle tracking systems (supplied via the DfT) has been undertaken, but it has not yet been possible to obtain a regular supply of this information. The indicator will be reviewed during the period of this LTP if improved sources of data become available.

Key Actions
Limiting traffic growth through land-use strategy; demand management (including support of this strategy in Bath, Bristol and Swindon), the Public Transport Strategy and Travelwise.

Principal Risks & Management
Journey times will be adversely affected if traffic growth in the A350 corridor is higher than forecast. Remedial action will be considered, bearing in mind that the objective is to improve the reliability of journey times, and that this indicator does not directly measure this.
CHAPTER 15
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LW25w: A350 Journey time reliability (proxy - multiple road works)

Year 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010
Target
Actual 100

Definition
Journey time reliability on the A350 between its junctions with the M4 and A36 (proxy). Due to the unavailability of vehicle tracking data for this route, a proxy indicator is substituted. This takes two parts: (1) Journey time excess (as higher congestion leads to less stable flows and journey times) – see previous table. (2) Multiple road works indicator (concurrent works leading to abnormal journey times). The multiple road works indicator is defined as the sum of the daily weighted numbers of significant road works in excess of 1 occurrence - “significant” implies disruption to the traffic flow by, for example, lane closure or single-file working. Weighting is applied so that days with high numbers of road works are treated as particularly detrimental; e.g. a day with 5 road works scores equivalent to 8 days on which there are 2 road works.

Data source
Council street works database.

Target
To achieve an 11% reduction in the value of the indicator by 2010 (This provides a reduction in the seriousness of delay attributable to the cause of multiple road works).

Evidence
Given baseline levels of congestion in 2010, improved journey time reliability will be indicated by a reduction in the number of incidences of multiple road works along the route. The baseline figure is taken from the year 2005 in which there were 48 days with multiple road works, of which two days had four sets of road works and one day had five sets. The following provides an indication of how the target may be achieved in reality: if one set of roadworks is moved from each of the days with five and four occurrences, and a set of roadworks is moved from one of the days with three occurrences, then provided these are all reallocated to days with no roadworks that would be sufficient to meet the target.

Benchmarking
No comparable indicators were located.

Consultation
Journey time reliability on the A350 was an issue identified through consultation on the first LTP.

Key Actions
Management of road works; particularly timing and publicity.

Principal Risks & Management
Without experience of the application of regulations under the Traffic Management Act 2004, it is uncertain how difficult the rescheduling of road works will be. Therefore, the target will be reviewed as soon as sufficient experience and data is acquired.
L26: Workplace travel plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Number of sites where an effective workplace travel plan is in operation. Effectiveness is determined by a set of criteria contained in the Supplementary Planning Document: ‘Development Related Travel Plans in Wiltshire: Good Practice Guide’ published by the County Council in conjunction with Wiltshire’s four district authorities.

**Data source**
Council assessment records.

**Target**
To have 111 travel plans approved by April 2011.

**Evidence**
From experience in Wiltshire over the last three years and from other authorities nationwide, most workplace travel plans will be secured through the development control process. Over 50 highway Section 106 agreements were secured in 2004/05, and it is reasonable to assume that the number of travel plans required as part of S106 agreements can at least equal that achieved previously, as this represents less than a third of all planning permissions.

Other factors leading to the development of workplace travel plans include:
- a growing ‘awareness raising’ campaign targeted at the business community in Wiltshire run by Travelwise in association with Chambers of Commerce, Economic Regeneration Teams, and District councils.
- funding to support business travel planning and the implementation of sustainable transport measures.
- the continued implementation of the Government’s travel plan guidance assisted by the Council’s own ‘Good Practice Guide on Development Related Travel Plans’ document to guide when travel plans are required.
- a dedicated staff officer to promote and assist organisations to develop travel plans.

**Benchmarking**
Many authorities have set targets for Workplace Travel Plans but comparison is difficult. Wiltshire’s target appears to be one of the more challenging.

**Consultation**
The provisional LTP2 target was considered to be “about right”. There was a considerable spread in the prioritisation of Travelwise initiatives, although tending towards lower priority.

**Review**
The above suggests that the target is appropriate for the aspirations and achievable.

**Key Actions**
Continue to promote and encourage take-up of voluntary travel plans. Develop travel planning networking groups in key business parks. Continue to give advice and monitor travel plans linked to planning conditions and agreements.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Lack of enforcement of travel plans. Members considering that the economic importance of a development overrides the importance of requiring a travel plan. Officers within the Development Control section of WCC are fully aware of the circumstances when workplace travel plans should be submitted. The four District Councils are improving their ability to apply the WCC Supplementary Planning Guidance document requirements. The dedicated WCC Travel Plan Officer is tasked with ensuring compliance.
## LS27: Park and ride passengers in Salisbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>189015</td>
<td>189960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definition
Annual total of passengers using all existing Park & Ride services serving central Salisbury.

### Data source
Records from bus ticket machines.

### Target
To carry at least 724,800 passengers per annum by 2010/11. The trajectory is based upon modelled predictions and anticipated opening dates for sites.

### Evidence
- London Road site opening 3rd July 2006.
- Petersfinger site programmed for opening Summer 2008.

### Benchmarking
No suitable benchmarking was available.

### Consultation
Consultation on the P&R proposals was undertaken for the first LTP. This particular target was not examined by the consultation on the provisional second LTP.

### Review
Projections are based on the rate of patronage take up at the opened sites at Beehive, Wilton and Britford.

### Key Actions
Completion of London Road and Petersfinger Park and Ride sites. Ongoing review and implementation of Parking Strategy including pricing.

### Principal Risks & Management
Protracted statutory procedures for Petersfinger site. This risk has been factored into the programme and will be addressed by ongoing monitoring. Ringfenced funding allocation for Petersfinger site insufficient to cover build costs. A costed risk register has been developed to allow management of project costs. Possible public opposition to Parking Strategy.
LS28 – Number of off-street long-stay parking spaces in central Salisbury

**LTP Objective**

P14

**Government Priority**

Congestion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

Number of designated long-stay parking spaces within the city centre.

**Data source**

District Council records.

**Target**

The requirements for long-stay parking in central Salisbury are to be redefined as part of the ongoing development of the ‘Vision for Salisbury’ initiative and in conjunction with the anticipated major redevelopment at The Maltings (affecting the Central Car Park site). The existing WCC Parking Strategy remains, and a target will be set within the timescale of the work noted.

**Evidence**

The provisional LTP2 target of 910 spaces arises from the Parking Strategy (including Park & Ride).

**Benchmarking**

One other authority specified a target for reducing the proportion of long-stay parking.

**Consultation**

Further consultation is anticipated at the appropriate time.

**Review**

A target will be provided during the period of the LTP2.

**Key Actions**

At this stage, ongoing monitoring.

**Principal Risks & Management**

As there is currently a high level of uncertainty associated with central parking requirements, the setting of a target has been deferred. This indicator is an output indicator that contributes to objectives measured by other indicators, i.e. LS27, LS1 and LTP8s. If the parking target is set higher than the provisional LTP2 figure then it may be necessary to invoke alternative measures to achieve these other objectives.
**LB8: Proportion of footpaths and other rights of way which were easy to use by members of the public (BV178)**

**Definition**
Percentage of total length of footpaths and other Rights of Way which were easy to use by members of the public, i.e.:
- Sign posted where they leave the road.
- Easy to use.
- In good repair.

**Data source**
A random 5% length sample survey generated by computer programme is carried out according to the standard national methodology agreed with the Audit Commission. The programme randomly selects individual paths until the required length is identified. The same trained surveyors are used for all the survey work in order to ensure consistency, with random checks carried out by members of the County Council’s Rights of Way team for verification purposes. A single fault along the whole length of an individually surveyed path causes the whole of that length to fail, even if the remainder of the path meets the required standards.

**Target**
To achieve 80% ‘easy to use’ in 2007/08. Longer term target to be determined from work on the Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

**Evidence**
Completed standard survey forms are returned by the surveyors and analysed by Council officers. The sampling error of the approved survey methodology gives a 90% confidence interval of ±3.6%, e.g. if the true value of the indicator is 70%, then there is a 0.9 probability of the measured value being between 66.4% and 73.6%.

**Benchmarking**
The provisional LTP2 target of 80% was towards the more stretching end of a range of shire counties in terms of absolute level. The rate of change required was more optimistic than for comparable authorities.

**Consultation**
The provisional LTP2 target was “about right” by the majority of respondents.

**Review**
It is necessary to take an overview of year-on-year results to identify the underlying accuracy of the figures and any emerging trends. The results to date suggest a reasonably consistent performance reflective of the year-on-year funding levels for Rights of Way maintenance, which has seen little change over the period.

**Key Actions**
Signposting of footpaths.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Disputes with landowners, failure of funding for Rights of Way maintenance to keep slightly ahead of inflation. Two new full-time Rights of Way Inspectors posts are proposed, which will enable problems to be identified at an earlier stage and the development of more targeted work programmes. It is considered that 80% is a realistic target that would be acceptable to the majority of users as a reasonable minimum standard for the Rights of Way network. The achievement of a more ambitious target across the County as a whole is unlikely to be possible due to factors beyond the control of the authority.
**TARGETS AND INDICATORS**

**CHAPTER 15**

### L29: Completed key bus route upgrades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Number of key bus routes (as defined in Appendix 4, Fig 4.1) on which bus stop and shelter upgrades completed. A route is defined as completed once all programmed improvement work has been carried out.

**Target**
To complete stop and shelter upgrades on all 17 key bus routes by 2010/11. The trajectory will depend upon detailed programme scheduling, but the indicative trajectory shown is a consequence of concurrent work on a number of routes, resulting in completions being concentrated towards the end of the LTP2 period.

**Evidence**
The key bus route upgrade programme was commenced during LTP1, and it is anticipated that 6 of the highest priority routes will be completed by the end of 2005-06. It is estimated that £3 million will be required to complete the remaining 11 routes, and this has been built into the proposed capital programme for LTP2.

**Consultation**
The dominant response was that the target was “about right”. However, the indicative spending of £4.1m over the LTP2 period was considered “too high” by a slight majority (revised estimates suggest that £3 million will be sufficient to complete the programme). Specific consultation with the major bus operators on their priorities for the LTP2 capital programme indicates that they support completion of the key routes programme as a high priority. Stakeholder consultation as part of the Best Value Review of passenger transport suggested that ‘visible’ improvements to infrastructure (such as new shelters) may have been a significant influence on the improved survey score for ‘satisfaction with local bus services’ in 2003. Consultation with disabled groups suggests strong support for the stop improvements which include raised ‘bus boarders’ to facilitate easy access.

**Review**
The target is considered to be justified by (a) the support from bus operators; (b) the impact on public satisfaction, (c) the sound basis it provides for Quality Partnerships, which have encouraged operator investment of over £10 million to date in new vehicles; (d) the benefits of an improved waiting environment for passengers; (e) easier access to the bus for disabled people and those with pushchairs or heavy luggage. It is considered achievable given the resources available through LTP funding.

**Key Actions**
Key Bus Route Network programme, Interchange improvements.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Increases in costs – will be monitored through regular service delivery meetings and corrective action taken if necessary. Delays due to consultation process, land ownership issues or contractor slippage – the programme will be designed to provide a regular flow of work to the contractor, with adequate time allowed for consultation and sufficient flexibility to allow for changes to the scheduling of works at individual stops without disrupting the programme as a whole. Progress to be monitored at regular service delivery meetings and corrective action taken to adjust the programme as necessary.
### L30: Satisfaction with Street Scene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
Composite public satisfaction indicator based on the recorded percentage satisfied or very satisfied with the following:
- quality and location of street furniture (e.g. benches, street lighting, signs, litter bins, railings)
- condition of the road and pavement surface
- well lit public spaces
- litter-free town centre
- weed killing, and maintenance of grassed areas
- enforcement of parking restrictions
- removal of abandoned vehicles

**Data source**
Survey using a panel of 5000 Wiltshire residents (known as “People’s Voice”).

**Target**
To improve the public satisfaction rating to 46.5% by the end of year 31st March 2008

**Evidence**
Improving the Street Scene is a key objective adopted by the County Local Strategic Partnership (Wiltshire Strategic Board) The target has been negotiated as part of a Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA)

**Benchmarking**
No comparable indicators were located.

**Consultation**
The issues for improvement have been identified from a number of sources including Peoples’ Voice. The target has been agreed with ODPM.

**Review**
The LPSA has set the target to 2007/08. A provisional target to maintain this improved position to 2010/11 has been shown. This will be subject to review.

**Key Actions**
Audit to identify priority locations for improvement of lighting and street furniture; coordinating management of abandoned vehicles; decriminalised parking enforcement

**Principal Risks & Management**
Many of the actions involve partner organisations, and there are potential resource constraints. The commitment of partners will be promoted through the Wiltshire Strategic Board.
R1: Completeness of Traveline data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>107%*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Anomaly due to changes in service data being processed before corresponding changes to SOCL data

**Definition**
Completeness and accuracy of Traveline Data (all-stop level). Data completeness and accuracy measurement to stop level is a measurement of the numbers of timetables for Wiltshire, live on the regional Traveline database, that include times for all bus stops and are up to date, divided by the number of timetables listed for Wiltshire on the Service Ownership Confirmation List (SOCL).

**Data source**
The yearly measurements will be taken as an average of 12 x monthly measurements taken by South West Public Transport Information Ltd (SWPTI). (Note that the three Actual figures shown above are September snapshots).

**Target**
For data supplied by WCC to exceed the indicated regional target of 99% in 2010/11. The trajectory arises from a common regional approach and does not imply that the Council is anticipating a decline.

**Evidence**
The South West region of Traveline is already the best English region in terms of performance and demand but significant work remains to ensure that timeliness and accuracy of changes to service information can be maintained at consistently high levels. If the service is on the database with one or more of its timetables out-of-date, it will be counted as incomplete. The target is slightly lower than would be set for data at timing points only because there are several times more stops than timing points, and there is thus more scope for errors.

**Benchmarking**
This will be available in the future as SWPTI will calculate figures for each transport authority using a consistent methodology.

**Consultation**
The indicator was approved by all South West transport authorities at a General Meeting of SWPTI Ltd.

**Review**
The target is objective-based but appears to be achievable.

**Key Actions**
Ensuring details of service changes are promptly actioned and timeliness recorded.

**Principal Risks & Management**
Maintenance of the data relies on the continuing availability and resourcing of staff with the necessary understanding of bus timetable issues and data processing procedures. This is achieved through the regional Traveline project. As the project is at the development stage, it is funded through the LTP process as a capital expense, but there is currently no source of revenue funding to maintain the project once fully developed. It is anticipated that the development phase will continue throughout the five-year LTP2 period.

Electronic Registration of bus services, currently being trialled, could make it more difficult for local authorities to ascertain changes to bus services unless the Traffic Commissioner devises an appropriate procedure for bus operators to follow, and ensures it is followed. This issue is being considered by the National Traveline Board as part of a long term review of Traveline.

Progress is monitored at quarterly meetings of SWPTI Ltd.
### R2: Verification of Traveline data

#### Financial year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definition

Proportion of Travel Data verified. This is a measurement of the numbers of timetables for Wiltshire live on the regional Traveline database that have been verified as correct and up-to-date by the bus operator, divided by the number of timetables for Wiltshire live on the regional Traveline database.

#### Data source

The yearly measurements will be taken as an average of 12 x monthly measurements taken by SWPTI Ltd (note that the three Actual figures shown above are September snapshots).

#### Target

For data supplied by WCC to achieve the indicated regional target of 90% in 2010/11. The trajectory is from a region-wide agreement.

#### Evidence

The South West region of Traveline is already the best English region in terms of performance and demand but continuous work is required to ensure that accuracy is maintained. Data from some data suppliers in the South West region have already passed 90% but timeliness of verification is an issue. When bus services are changed, new data must be submitted and these must be verified again by the bus operator. Hence, this figure can go down if re-verification is not carried out promptly.

#### Benchmarking

This will be available in the future as SWPTI will calculate figures for each transport authority using a consistent methodology.

#### Consultation

The indicator was approved by all South West transport authorities at a General Meeting of SWPTI Ltd.

#### Review

The step-change for 2006/07 is particularly challenging for the County Council.

#### Key Actions

Ensuring details of service changes are promptly verified by the bus operator.

#### Principal Risks & Management

The biggest potential risk is the willingness of bus operators to carry out verification since this involves a commitment of their staff time. However, all large bus operators in the South West region are members of SWPTI Ltd, have signed a legally binding agreement and are committed to the project at senior level. The quality of the unverified data will affect how quickly it can be verified as inaccurate data must be corrected first. However, the experience with Wiltshire data has identified few inaccuracies. Maintenance of this data relies on the continuing availability and resourcing of staff with the necessary understanding of bus timetable issues and data processing procedures. This is achieved through the regional Traveline project. As the project is at the development stage, it is funded through the LTP process as a capital expense, but there is currently no source of revenue funding to maintain the project once fully developed. It is anticipated that the development phase will continue throughout the five-year LTP2 period. Progress is monitored at quarterly meetings of SWPTI Ltd.
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Electronic version available at
local-transport-plan-2.htm
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