

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: - Reviewed (STP)	58% (48 out of 82 schools) (2006)	82 schools (100% by 2009)	London Borough Richmond upon Thames
	PI		- 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%	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)	Non-car travel by 2011 63%	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%), $\frac{3}{4}$ 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