

CHAPTER 9

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

9.0 Introduction

- 9.0.1 The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames is already subject to a number of performance indicators and targets that measure its performance in the public realm. Many of the transport related performance indicators count towards the Council's CPA rating which is currently "Good".
- 9.0.2 Performance Measures provide a measurable indication of the success of schemes that have been implemented in the Borough, identify areas where more, or less resources are needed; and allow trend analysis to be undertaken by monitoring changes over time. The Targets detailed in this Chapter will be used on an annual basis as a part of the LIP Annual Progress Report.
- 9.0.3 This final version of the LIP has been updated with targets from TfL that have been developed in the interim between the production of the draft LIP for May 2005 and this final version in October 2006. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that where any other targets are still outstanding that a Borough response to these will be provided in subsequent annual LIP updates.
- 9.0.4 This chapter also contains Table 4.1 which sets out the Mayor's "priority areas for implementation" and MTS priorities, policies and proposals.
- 9.0.5 Monitoring of the performance indicators and targets is carried out by one or more of the following bodies:

| BODY | ABBREVIATION |
|--|--------------|
| London Borough of Richmond upon Thames | LBRUT |
| LBRUT Best Value | BV |
| LBRUT Comprehensive Performance Assessment | CPA |
| Transport for London | TfL |
| Office of the Deputy Prime Minister | OPDM |
| Department for Transport | DfT |
| Census Office | CO |
| London Area Transport Statistics | LATS |
| Association of London Government | ALG |

9.1 Commentary on Table 9.1

- 9.1.1 The Borough is on track to meet the 2010 casualty reduction targets and is working towards improving the environment for vulnerable road users to ensure they are looked after. As an update to the draft LIP, target 1 now includes accident data disaggregated by ethnic group. This will be helpful to determine whether there are a disproportionate number of accidents involving ethnic minority groups and to determine what road safety programmes could be introduced.
- 9.1.2 In terms of school road safety the Borough considers that it is making good progress to achieving the target of 100% with an approved School Travel Plan in place by 2009. The implementation side of School Travel Plans may be more tenuous given resourcing and

delays caused by changes resulting from consultation as well as not yet knowing the level of measures required. Notwithstanding this, at the present level of implementation, the Borough would like to see measures implemented at 50% of schools by 2011. The Borough considers that this target is achievable.

- 9.1.3 The London-wide bus excess wait time data have been used for Target 3. The proposals for parallel initiatives, and new bus priority measures will help contribute to a further reduction in excess wait times. The Bus Stop Accessibility programme should also assist with reducing wait times at accessible bus stops.
- 9.1.4 As an update to the draft LIP the Borough has populated the Bus target data as much as possible and hopes to show year on year improvements across all areas. It is pleased with progress in terms of accessible bus stops and the programme planned for the next few years will continue to progress well. It is also anticipated that there will be growth in terms of bus priority junctions and additional bus lanes. It is not yet clear what the targets are for some of the bus targets and it is hoped to work with TfL to determine these for inclusion the LIP updates.
- 9.1.5 With regard to Target 5, the Borough is aware of an outer London target of at least 30% reduction over the 10-year period between 2001 and 2011. However, it seems that at the time of writing the LIP (2006 amendments) that this will be very difficult to achieve. In considering the target to set, consideration has been given to the targets that have been set by neighbouring outer London Boroughs with approved LIP's in place. The Royal Borough of Kingston is aiming for a 3% reduction. Given that Richmond can take advantage of different transport options it is hoped to achieve a target of 4% reduction by 2011.
- 9.1.6 The proportion of non-car travel in terms of overall modal share appears to be tracking slowly but in a positive direction. It is hoped that with a change in focus of the Borough to more sustainable forms of travel, non-car travel will continue to increase in terms of overall modal share.
- 9.1.7 The respective targets relating to non-car trips to school and work are relatively conservative although it is hoped with the Borough's ongoing programme of Travel Awareness, new cycle and walking routes, and School and Work Travel Plans that this will be achieved. Depending on progress it is intended to review the target on an annual basis.
- 9.1.8 The Borough looks forward to working with TfL on monitoring various parking matters such as the degree of contravention of parking and bus lane regulations. As noted in Table 4.1, the Borough does not have any metropolitan major town centres as classified by TfL. Richmond is the only major town centre in the Borough that can be included but for the time being the Borough has decided not to include it for monitoring purposes.
- 9.1.9 The Borough would like to see a year-on-year improvement to the number and rate of trips made by equality groups. It is difficult to provide an actual target as the baseline data is so low and potentially within the survey margin of error. It is hoped that as the figure increases (through improved access measures) that a more robust target can be developed.
- 9.1.10 The Borough is well on track to meet the 100% target of pedestrian crossings with disabled features. The key here will be for the Borough to push on with the programme and ensure that the remaining, potentially difficult, crossings are upgraded.
- 9.1.11 The rate and volume of walking trips is very difficult to monitor and the Borough would rely on the LATS data to monitor progression of this target. The target of 1.25 trips per person in the Borough is considered to be achievable although it will always be difficult in an outer London Borough to achieve a high target on a 100% walking trip basis. Many of the

residents in the Borough work outside the area and often walk to stations before taking public transport.

9.1.12 As with walking, cycling is also difficult to monitor but based on the 2001 LATS data it is anticipated that an increase to 8% by 2011 for work trips and 11% for school trips should be achievable given the Borough programme of School and Work Travel Plans.

9.1.13 In Terms of Target 14, the Department for Transport recently changed the way in which they wanted Local Authorities to display the road condition information by introducing a traffic light warning system. Now road condition is classified in the following way:

Condition Index (CI) <20 is (Green)
Condition Index (CI) >=20 is (Amber)
Condition Index (CI) >=100 is (Red)

9.1.14 This new system means it is difficult to provide a baseline that future data can be compared to. The baseline provided in the draft LIP was under the old system and relates to a CI of 70. For the purpose of providing a new baseline, the Council considers that the proportions of TLRN in the red and amber categories will provide a consistent baseline for the future, given the change. The targets at 8% for red and 25% for amber by 2010/11 are based on the current level of measurement for road condition and do not take account of future changes to measurement which may occur.

Table 9.1: Mayor’s “priority areas for implementation” and MTS priorities, policies and proposals

| LIP Guidance Priority Area for Implementation | TfL Target number | PI description | Definition of Performance Indicator | Baseline Data (date included) | Target | Data Source |
|---|-------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| I. Improving road safety | Target 1 | Killed and Seriously Injured | Adults killed and seriously injured overall and separately for: | 135 (average of 1994-98) (interim targets of 94 for 2006/07 and 86 for 2008/09) | 40% reduction by 2010 | London Road Safety Unit; TfL |
| | | | Pedestrians | 32 (average of 1994-98) (interim targets of 22 for 2006/07 and 20 for 2008/09) | 40% reduction by 2010 | |
| | | | Cyclists | 21 (average of 1994-98) (interim targets of 15 for 2006/07 and 13 for 2008/09) | 40% reduction by 2010 | |
| | | | Motorcyclists | 24 (average of 1994-98) (interim targets of 17 for 2006/07 and 15 for 2008/09) | 40% reduction by 2010 | |
| | | | Number of children killed or seriously injured | 14 (average of 1994-98) (interim targets of 9 for 2006/07 and 8 for 2008/09) | 50% reduction by 2010 | |
| | | | The slight casualty rate (adults and children) | 264.2 in 2003/04 (interim targets of 236.5 for 2006/07 and 227.6 for 2008/09 with the end target being 222.4 in 2010) | 10% reduction in the casualty rate per 100 million vehicle kilometres | |
| | | | All data disaggregated by: | | | |

| LIP Guidance Priority Area for Implementation | TfL Target number | PI description | Definition of Performance Indicator | Baseline Data (date included) | Target | Data Source |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethnic group for pedestrians injuries - Vehicle classification for all incidents - All data measured in calendar years | Ethnic breakdown of KSI (2001 and 2005): White skinned European 19, 14 Dark skinned European 0, 0 Afro/Caribbean 0, 0 Arab 0, 0 Asian 0, 0 Oriental 0, 0 Unknown 6, 2 | 40% reduction (as per rate for pedestrians) | |
| | Target 2 | School Road Safety | Number and percentage of primary and secondary schools: | 58% (48 out of 82 schools) (2006) | 82 schools (100% by 2009) | London Borough Richmond upon Thames |
| | PI | | - Reviewed (STP) - With schemes implemented | 2005/06: 30 schools with some form of measure implemented – 36% | 50% by 2011 | London Borough Richmond upon Thames |
| II. Improving bus journey times and reliability | Target 3 | Bus Excess Wait time | Bus EWT (High Frequency Routes), minutes per customer | London-wide average EWT 1.4 (2003/04) 2001: 2.2 minutes EWT | 2009/10: 1.3 minutes EWT | London Buses |
| | Target 4 | Borough Bus Target | 8% of total daily work trips 28% of total daily school trips (LATS 2001 Household Survey) | Awaiting further specification from TfL. | | |
| | PI | Bus Lanes | Total bus lane kilometre/hours in operation | 17 Bus Lanes 0700-1000- 1480m 0700-1900- 1555m 1600-1900- 280m 24 hours- 1585m | NA | Bus Priority, Surface Transport |

| LIP Guidance Priority Area for Implementation | TfL Target number | PI description | Definition of Performance Indicator | Baseline Data (date included) | Target | Data Source |
|--|-------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| | PI | Bus priority junctions | Number of Bus priority junctions in operation | 17 Bus Priority Sites | NA | Bus Priority, Surface Transport |
| | PI | Bus stop clearways | Number and percentage of bus stops with clearways | 60% (293 out of 489 bus stops) have clearways | NA | Bus Priority, Surface Transport |
| | PI | Accessible bus stops | Number and percentage of accessible bus stops | 112 accessible bus stops between 04/05 and 06/07. Figure not known prior to 04/05. (489 bus stops in total) | Awaiting target from TfL | Bus Priority, Surface Transport |
| III. Relieving traffic congestion and improving journey time reliability including through the use of travel demand measures | Target 5 | Traffic volumes in outer London and town Centres | Million vehicle kms per year estimated by DfT | 2001: 916 million vehicle kilometres (mvk) 2002: 920mvk 2004: 914 mvk | Borough target for 2011 is a 4% reduction to 879 mvk per annum | DfT- Road Traffic Statistics for local authorities LB RuT automatic traffic counter information |
| | Target 6 | General traffic journey time reliability | Under development by TfL | | | |

| LIP Guidance Priority Area for Implementation | TfL Target number | PI description | Definition of Performance Indicator | Baseline Data (date included) | Target | Data Source |
|---|--|---------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------|
| | Target 7 | Modal Share | Proportion of travel on foot | 32.5% (2001) | Non-car travel by 2007 60% Non-car travel by 2011 63% | 2001 LATS |
| | | | Proportion of travel by pedal cycle | 2.1% (2001) | | 2001 LATS |
| | | | Proportion of travel by powered two wheeler | 1.1% (2001) | | 2001 LATS |
| | | | Proportion of travel by car | 43.7% (2001) | | 2001 LATS |
| | | | Proportion of travel by taxi | 1.1% (2001) | | 2001 LATS |
| | | | Proportion of travel by coach or bus | 7.9% (2001) | | 2001 LATS |
| | | | Proportion of travel by goods vehicle | 0.6% (2001) | | 2001 LATS |
| | | | Proportion of travel by other means | 11.2% (2001) | | 2001 LATS |
| | | | Proportion of travel by means other than a car | 56.3% (2001) | | 2001 LATS |
| | Target 8 | School Travel Plans | Number and percentage of schools: - where review of travel has been completed | 58% -48 out of 82 (March 2006) | 40% by 2006 and 100% by end of 2009 | Borough |
| PI | - where travel plan deemed necessary and developed | | 58%- 48 out of 82 (March 2006) | Borough | | |
| PI | - where travel plan implemented | | 25 out of 82 (March 2006)- 30% as at 2005/06 | Borough | | |

| LIP Guidance Priority Area for Implementation | TfL Target number | PI description | Definition of Performance Indicator | Baseline Data (date included) | Target | Data Source |
|---|-------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | PI | School travel-modal share, non-car modes | School trips by modes other than car, proportion of mechanised and non-mechanised trips as defined in the LTDS | School Trips by modes other than car: 66% (2001) Proportion of mechanised and non-mechanised trips: 72% to 28% (mechanised includes bicycle) (2001) | Target in 2007 is 69% Target in 2011 is 72% | LATS 2001 (TfL- Borough Extranet site) |
| | PI | Work travel-modal share, non-car modes | Work trips by modes other than car, proportion of mechanised and non-mechanised trips as defined in the LTDS | 2001: 57% non-car trips to work Proportion of mechanised trips to non-mechanised trips- 85% and 15% (cycling is non-mechanised) | Target in 2007 is 60% Target in 2011 is 63% | LATS 2001 |
| IV. Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements to provide fair, reasonable and effective enforcement of regulations, recognising the needs of business for servicing and delivery as well as other road users, thus contributing to easing congestion and improving access to town centres and regeneration areas | Target 9 | Parking Compliance Factor | London wide figure aggregating the degree of contravention of parking and bus lane regulations. Baseline being established | To be agreed once performance indicator is developed | To be agreed once performance indicator is developed | TfL Transport Policing and Enforcement |
| | PI | Business Satisfaction | Business satisfaction survey developed by TfL | | | TfL in liaison with business organisations |
| | PI | Public provision of long stay parking supply both on and off street | Change in parking supply for metropolitan major town centres | The Borough does not have any metropolitan major town centres as classified by TfL, but may choose to list major town centres, of which the Borough has Richmond | N/A | N/A |

| LIP Guidance Priority Area for Implementation | TfL Target number | PI description | Definition of Performance Indicator | Baseline Data (date included) | Target | Data Source |
|--|-------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| V. Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network. Plans should have regard to safety and security for women and vulnerable users | Target 10 | The number and rate of trips made by E & I groups | Number and rate of trips made on each mode of transport as defined in and measured by LTDS for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disabled people (all disabilities aggregated, all day) - Older people (all aged over 65, all day) - Women travelling between 19.00-07.00 hrs | Public Transport 0.6 Walking and Cycling 2.6 Car 0.8 Taxi 0.1 | Year on year improvement | TfL Borough Extranet |
| | PI | The percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people (BV 165) | As per BV measure; this indicator only includes zebra, pelican, puffin and toucan crossings, and traffic lights with a pedestrian phase. All crossings at a set of traffic lights or at a roundabout should be counted as one crossing. All crossings at one large roundabout with a series of mini-roundabouts should likewise be counted as one crossing | 2003-04 Zebra 85 (82=96%) Pelican/Toucan/Puffin 63 (63=100%) ATS Pedestrian phase 26 (29=90%) | 100% by 2010 | Borough |
| | Target 11 | Taxicard | Achievement of compliance with London-wide standard | (must be over 90%), ¾ monthly average | Awaiting London-wide agreed target | |

| LIP Guidance Priority Area for Implementation | TfL Target number | PI description | Definition of Performance Indicator | Baseline Data (date included) | Target | Data Source |
|--|-------------------|--|--|--|---|----------------------------|
| VI. Encourage walking by improving the street environment, conditions for pedestrians and through the use of travel demand measures | Target 12 | Volume and rate of walking trips | Number and rate per person of walking trips per annum, as measured by LTDS. Walking trips are those where the person walks all the way. This excludes walks that are one leg of a journey involving other modes of transport | 182,230 (1.05 trips per person) (2001) | Interim target 2007:198185 (1.15 trips per person) Target 2011: 215419 (1.25 trips per person) | LATS 2001 Household Survey |
| | PI | Condition of footway | Proportion of footway in categories 1, 1a and 2 as per BV performance indicator 187 | 60% is classified as 1 and 2. (The Borough has no category 1a). 2003/04 | 10% reduction each year over 5 years | Borough |
| VII. Encourage cycling by improving conditions for cyclists and through the use of travel demand measures | Target 13 | Volume and rate of cycle trips | Number and rate per person of cycling trips per annum, as measured by LTDS. Cycling trips are those where the person cycles the whole way. This excludes cycling as one leg | 2001: 4% of total daily work trips 2001: 7% of total daily school trips | 2011: 8% 2011: 11% | LATS 2001 Household Survey |
| VIII. Bringing transport infrastructure to a state of good repair | Target 14 | Condition of 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes | Road condition, share of TLRN and BPRN carriageway lower than score of 70 from UKPMS (This has been changed to A Roads with a Condition Index of red)- see para 9.1.13. 'A' Roads with a Condition Index of amber is also provided | 2005/06: Proportion of 'A' Roads with a condition index of red is 12.87% Proportion of 'A' Roads with a condition index of amber is 32.75% | 2010/11 8% 25% | Borough-Highways Section |