

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This chapter sets out the performance measures that will be used to measure Islington Council's progress in achieving the transport objectives and policies outlined in Chapter 3. These performance measures consist of a range of targets and performance indicators designed to contribute towards achievement of the Mayor's Transport Strategy as well as the council's transport objectives to make Islington's transport system:

1. Safe
2. Accessible
3. Green
4. Efficient
5. Secure
6. Attractive

Performance measures are the targets and performance indicators that will be used to measure and benchmark the council's progress in implementing this strategy

1.2 These targets and performance indicators can also be used to benchmark Islington's performance against comparable local authorities.

2.0 Background and Issues

2.1 A number of issues have been addressed in compiling the performance measures for this strategy, as discussed below.

Definitions: Targets vs. Performance Indicators

2.2 It is important to understand the difference between a target and a performance indicator. A target is a performance measure for which the council has set a date to achieve a specific measurable outcome. A performance indicator, on the other hand, is a performance measure for which the council monitors progress but does not set target dates by which outcomes must be achieved.

2.3 As an example, if the council measures how many of its pedestrian crossings are wheelchair accessible and reports the results on a regular basis, this is a performance indicator. It indicates how well we are performing. However, if we commit to making all pedestrian crossings wheelchair accessible by a specific date, this is a target.

Targets are performance measures for which the council has set a date to achieve a specific measurable outcome

Performance indicators are performance measures for which the council monitors progress but does not set target dates by which outcomes must be achieved

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Balancing Priorities and Working in Partnership

2.4 It is important to understand the following three factors:

1. The targets and performance indicators are interconnected. On the whole, a high level of achievement in one area will support achievement in another. However, in some cases a high level of achievement in one area may actually reduce our ability to deliver in another. The conflicting priorities must therefore be carefully balanced in order to create a more effective network overall.
2. The council's ability to deliver improved performance is dependent upon a range of resource issues. These issues are common to all London local authorities and are described in detail in chapters 5 and 6.
3. Improved performance is also dependent upon a number of factors outside the council's direct control. These factors include:
 - transport and land use measures implemented in neighbouring boroughs and across London
 - the management of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) within Islington and beyond the borough's borders
 - investment by Transport for London and the rail industry in strategic public transport infrastructure improvements

2.5 The council will therefore need to work closely with its external partners to improve performance and deliver shared priorities.

Ability to Report on Performance Measures

2.6 The council's ability to measure its performance against these indicators and targets is dependent on a further range of factors. First, robust and up-to-date data must be available. For many of the measures, the required data is collected and analysed on an annual basis (see second column of Table 7.1). Where this is the case, progress will be reported annually in the Street Management Annual Business Plan and in Islington's Borough Spending Plan submission. However, the London Area Travel Survey is the only source of data that can be used for monitoring several of the indicators and targets, and it is only carried out every ten years. Census data is also only available every ten years. The council will therefore be able to measure performance in some areas less frequently.

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- 2.7 Another related issue is the slight difference between existing transport performance measures and those required in TfL's LIP guidance. Islington Council is keen to carry out monitoring as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible, so as to be able to focus as much resource as possible on delivering actual transport improvements. The council strongly supports standardised and meaningful transport performance measures, but is hesitant to commit to measuring, let alone set targets against, new or as yet undefined indicators and targets. The council will continue discussions with TfL and other London local authorities to further specify the required indicators and to ensure that robust data is available.
- 2.8 Finally, local authorities in London are required to monitor and report on a number of different transport-related policies and strategies. But there are a limited number of meaningful and measurable indicators available. This makes it even more important for LIP performance measures to be standardised. Islington Council intends to integrate our monitoring of the implementation of this transport strategy with our monitoring of the Strategic Environmental Assessment of this strategy, the council's network management duty in implementing the Traffic Management Act 2004, and our annual Borough Spending Plan bids. In addition, a Highways PFI would make targets even more important in terms of managing the performance of a private contractor, and could potentially add other measures to existing suites of measures. Clarity and transparency is therefore of utmost importance in the selection of measures.

3.0 STS Targets and Performance Indicators

- 3.1 Transport for London's Local Implementation Plan guidance identifies a number of 'priority areas for implementation'. Table 7.1 shows how our targets and performance indicators link to these priority areas. To simplify the table, a number of acronyms are used. A full list of abbreviations and their meanings is provided at the beginning of the strategy.
- 3.2 You will note that the interim and end target columns are shaded for the performance indicators. This is because TfL does not require boroughs to set targets for performance indicators. However, where the council has already committed to a target on some of these measures, the targets have been included.

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Table 7.1: Islington's STS targets and performance indicators

Target/PI	Performance Indicator Description	Baseline Measure	Interim target – 2006/07	Interim target – 2008/09	End target	Islington LIP Objective	Source
I. Improving road safety							
Target LIP1a	Number of people killed or seriously injured annually (Data updated annually)	94-98: 185.6 2003: 162 2004: 99	<126	<119	<111 (40% reduction by 2010)	Safe	LIP Guidance Target
Target LIP1b	Number of pedestrians killed or seriously injured annually (Data updated annually)	94-98: 76.0 2003: 49 2004: 25	<52	<49	<46 (40% reduction by 2010)	Safe	LIP Guidance Target
Target LIP1c	Number of cyclists killed or seriously injured annually (Data updated annually)	94-98: 26 2003: 25 2004: 17	<18	<17	<16 (40% reduction by 2010)	Safe	LIP Guidance Target
Target LIP1d	Number of people killed or seriously injured while operating powered two-wheel vehicles annually (Data updated annually)	94-98: 31.8 2003: 46 2004: 33	<22	<20	<19 (40% reduction by 2010)	Safe	LIP Guidance Target
Target LIP1e	Number of children (under 16 years) killed or seriously injured (Data updated annually)	94-98: 18.6 2003: 20 2004: 4	<12	<10	<9 (50% reduction by 2010)	Safe	LIP Guidance Target
Target LIP1f	Overall number of slight casualties ¹ (Data updated annually)	94-98: 1,113.8 2003: 970 2004: 804	<1025	<1014	<1002	Safe	LIP Guidance Target
Target LIP1g	Number of casualties (killed or seriously injured, and slight) for all vehicle classifications (Data updated annually)					Safe	LIP Guidance Target; data from London Accident Analysis Unit

Casualties – Baseline and targets by vehicle classification

Mode	Baseline data			Targets		
	1994-98	2003/04	2004/05	2006/07	2008/09	2010/11
Pedestrians	335.4	262	181	< 290	< 285	< 279
Pedal cycles	203.8	181	168	< 181	< 178	< 176
PTWs	253.2	258	223	< 225	< 222	< 218
Cars	382.8	310	211	< 342	< 337	< 332
Other	125.2	4	120	< 112	< 110	< 109
Total	1299.4	1,132	903	< 1151	< 132	< 1114

¹ The slight casualty target may eventually be measured as a rate per 100 million vehicle kilometres, but until further guidance is received from the DfT slight casualties will be monitored as numbers.

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Target/PI	Performance Indicator Description	Baseline Measure	Interim target – 2006/07	Interim target – 2008/09	End target	Islington LIP Objective	Source
PI LIP26	Number of pedestrian injuries by ethnic group <i>(Data updated annually)</i>					Safe	LIP Guidance Target; data from TfL
	Ethnic Group	2003	2004				
	White-skinned European	138	97				
	Dark-skinned European	14	17				
	Afro-Caribbean	47	21				
	Asian	5	4				
	Oriental	5	5				
	Arab	1	5				
	Not Known	52	32				
	Sum	262	181				
Target LIP2	Percentage of primary and secondary schools reviewed for school road safety <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	31% (19)	68% (42)	100% (62)	100% (62) by end of 2008	Safe	LIP Guidance Target; data from LBI
PI LIP15	Percentage of primary and secondary schools with school road safety schemes implemented <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	31% (19)				Safe	LIP Guidance PI; data from LBI
II. Improving bus journey times and reliability							
Target LIP3	Bus Excess Waiting Time (High Frequency Routes), minutes per customer <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04 EWT (minutes): London = 1.4 Islington = 1.37	Where possible, Islington will assist TfL in meeting their target to reduce bus EWT to 1.3 minutes per passenger journey by 2009/10 – no borough-specific target			Efficient	LIP Guidance Target; data from London Buses Quality of Service Indicators
Target LIP4	'Borough bus target' <i>[TfL to define target by summer 2005]</i>	N/A				Efficient	LIP Guidance Target
PI LIP16	Total bus lane kilometre/hours in operation per borough	[awaits TfL data]				Efficient	LIP Guidance PI
PI LIP17	Number of bus priority junctions in operation	[awaits TfL data]				Efficient	LIP Guidance PI
PI LIP18	Number and percentage of bus stops with clearways per borough	[awaits TfL data]				Efficient	LIP Guidance PI
PI LIP19	Number and percentage of accessible bus stops per borough	[awaits TfL data]				Accessible	LIP Guidance PI

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Target/ PI	Performance Indicator Description	Baseline Measure	Interim target – 2006/07	Interim target – 2008/09	End target	Islington LIP Objective	Source
III. Relieving traffic congestion							
Target LIP5	Volume of traffic in Islington (Data updated every 10 years)	2001: 485 million vehicle kilometres	Targets set out in MTS (reduction in weekday traffic of 15% in central London, zero growth across the rest of inner London between 2001 and 2011) have been exceeded through introduction of congestion charging. The council intends to maintain these reductions in the face of significant population and employment increases in the borough in the years to come			Efficient	LIP Guidance Target; DfT National Road Traffic Survey
Target LIP6	General traffic journey time reliability <i>[TfL to define target and provide data]</i>	N/A				Efficient	LIP Guidance Target
Target LIP7	To increase the proportion of personal travel made by modes other than the car (Data updated every 10 years)	Data for all trips does not exist, so a target could not be set.			Green	LIP Guidance Target; data from LATS 2001 Household Survey	
Islington Modal Split (%)							
Main Mode		Work	Education				
National Rail		4	4				
Underground/DLR		28	15				
Bus/Tram		20	26				
Taxi		1	0				
Other		0	0				
Car driver		16	1				
Car passenger		2	7				
Van/Lorry		1	0				
Motorcycle		2	0				
Cycle		4	3				
Walk		21	44				
Total daily trips		45,131 (100%)	23,793 (100%)				
Target LIP8	Percentage of schools that have developed a school travel plan (Data updated annually)	2004/05: 3% 2 out of 62 total	68% (42)	100% (62)	100% (62) by end of 2008	Green, Safe	LIP Guidance Target; data from LBI
PI LIP20	Proportion of school trips by modes other than car	Trips not by car: 92%				Green	LIP Guidance PI; data from LATS 2001 Household Survey
PI LIP21	Proportion of work trips by modes other than car (Data updated every 10 years)	Trips not by car: 82%				Green	LIP Guidance PI; data from LATS 2001 Household Survey

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Target/PI	Performance Indicator Description	Baseline Measure	Interim target – 2006/07	Interim target – 2008/09	End target	Islington LIP Objective	Source
IV. Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements							
Target LIP9	Parking compliance <i>[TfL to define target]</i>	N/A				Efficient	LIP Guidance Target
PI LIP22	Business satisfaction with fairness of enforcement of parking and loading regulations	[Awaits TfL survey data]				Efficient	LIP Guidance PI
PI LIP23a	Change in parking supply for Angel Town Centre	(Data available on an ad-hoc basis)				Efficient	LIP Guidance PI
PI LIP23b	Change in parking supply for Nag's Head Town Centre	No data available				Efficient	LIP Guidance PI
V. Improving accessibility and social inclusion							
TTarget LIP10a	Number and rate of trips made by disabled people (all disabilities aggregated, all day)	Borough-specific baseline data not yet available	Unable to set target as data is not available for individual boroughs			Accessible	LIP Guidance Target; data from LATS 2001 Household Survey
Target LIP10b	Number and rate of trips made by older people (all aged over 65, all day)	Borough-specific baseline data not yet available	Unable to set target as data is not available for individual boroughs			Accessible	LIP Guidance Target

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Target/ PI	Performance Indicator Description	Baseline Measure	Interim target – 2006/07	Interim target – 2008/09	End target	Islington LIP Objective	Source
Target LIP10c	Number and rate of trips made by women travelling between 19.00-07.00 hrs	Borough-specific baseline data not yet available	Unable to set target as data is not available for individual boroughs			Accessible	LIP Guidance Target; data from LATS 2001 Household Survey
	London share of travel by time of day for men and women						
	Time Period	Men	Women				
	07.00-10.00	47.3	52.7				
	10.00-16.00	42.5	57.5				
	16.00-19.00	50.0	50.0				
	19.00-22.00	53.5	46.5				
	22.00-04.00	58.6	41.4				
	04.00-07.00	72.6	27.4				
	All	48.0	52.0				
PI LIP24 (BV 165)	Percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 69% 2004/05: 100%	100% target already reached			Accessible	LIP Guidance PI; data from LBI PFS
Target LIP11a	Taxicard – percentage of taxis arriving within 15 minutes of advanced booking time <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04 monthly average: [awaiting data from ALG]	Unable to set target until an all-London standard is agreed			Accessible	LIP Guidance Target; data from ALG
Target LIP11b	Taxicard – percentage of taxis arriving within 30 minutes for ASAP bookings <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04 monthly average: [awaiting data from ALG]	Unable to set target until an all-London standard is agreed			Accessible	LIP Guidance Target; data from ALG
VI. Encouraging walking							
Target LIP12	Volume and rate per person of walking trips per annum [TfL and boroughs are to achieve an increase of at least 10% in journeys made on foot per person in London between 2001 and 2015. A 15% population growth has been factored into 2015 rate target.]	2001 baseline: Number of walking trips per day in Islington – 175,731 Trips per person per day – 0.977 <i>(Data updated every 10 years)</i>	Trips per day – 190,000 Trips per person per day – 1.000	Trips per day – 200,000 Trips per person per day – 1.030	By 2015: 25% increase in trips per day – 220,000 10% increase in trips per person per day – 1.075	Green	LIP Guidance Target; data from LATS 2001 Household Survey database; population from census
PI LIP 25 (BV 187)	Proportion of footway in poor condition (categories 1, 1a and 2) <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 14.2%	8%	4%	0 (2010/11)	Accessible	LIP Guidance PI; data from LBI PFS and BVPP

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Target/ PI	Performance Indicator Description	Baseline Measure	Interim target – 2006/07	Interim target – 2008/09	End target	Islington LIP Objective	Source
VII. Encouraging cycling							
Target LIP13	Volume and rate per person of cycling trips per annum [TfL and boroughs are to achieve an increase of at least 80% in cycling in London between 2001 and 2011. A 10% population growth has been factored into 2011 rate target.]	2001 baseline: Number of cycling trips per day in Islington - 10,554 Trips per person per day - 0.059 <i>(Data updated every 10 years)</i>	Trips per day - 15,000 Trips per person per day – 0.070	Trips per day – 17,000 Trips per person per day – 0.0830	By 2011: 80% increase in trips per day – 19,000 63% increase in trips per person per day – 0.096	Green	LIP Guidance Target; data from LATS 2001 Household Survey database; population from census
VIII. Bringing transport infrastructure to a state of good repair							
Target LIP14	Proportion of Borough Principal Road Network (BPRN) carriageway lower than score of 70 from UKPMS <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	No target set – see BV96				Efficient	LIP Guidance Target; data to be provided by LBI and TfL
Other LBI performance indicators							
PI BV89	Percentage of resident satisfaction with street cleansing service <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2004: 55%				Attractive	LBI; PFS Review
PI BV96	Percentage of principal roads with negative residual life derived from deflectograph, UKPMS CVI or DVI surveys (@70+ defect score) <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 26.55%	13%	7%	0% (2010/11)	Efficient	LBI; PFS Review & BVPP
PI BV97a	Percentage of non-principal classified roads with negative residual life derived from UKPMS survey <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 17.78%	14%			Efficient	LBI; PFS Review & BVPP
PI BV97b	Percentage of non-principal unclassified roads with negative residual life derived from UKPMS survey <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 15.23%	15%			Efficient	LBI; PFS Review & BVPP
PI BV100	Number of days temporary traffic controls or road closure on traffic sensitive roads caused by local authority road works per km of traffic sensitive road <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 0.43				Efficient	LBI; BVPP
PI BV186a	Percentage of principal road network not needing major repair by cost per km <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 19.76				Efficient	LBI; BVPP
PI BV186b	Percentage of non-principal road network not needing major repair by cost per km <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 449				Efficient	LBI; BVPP

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Target/ PI	Performance Indicator Description	Baseline Measure	Interim target – 2006/07	Interim target – 2008/09	End target	Islington LIP Objective	Source
PI BV199	Local street and environmental cleanliness – Local Environmental Quality Survey score (LEQS) <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	2003/04: 36%				Attractive	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99ai	Number of pedestrians killed or seriously injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 43.11 03/04: 27.07 04/05: 13.81				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99aii	Number of pedestrians slightly injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 147.14 03/04: 117.67 04/05: 86.18				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99bi	Number of pedal cyclists killed or seriously injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 14.75 03/04: 13.8 04/05: 9.4				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV 99bii	Number of pedal cyclists slightly injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 100.86 03/04: 86.18 04/05: 83.42				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99ci	Number of powered two-wheeled vehicle users killed or seriously injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 18.04 03/04: 25.41 04/05: 18.23				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99cii	Number of powered two-wheeled vehicle users slightly injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 125.59 03/04: 117.12 04/05: 104.97				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99di	Number of car users killed or seriously injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 21.78 03/04: 16.57 04/05: 8.29				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99dii	Number of car users slightly injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 194.79 03/04: 154.69 04/05: 108.28				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99ei	Number of other vehicle users killed or seriously injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 7.60 03/04: 6.63 04/05: 4.97				Safe	LBI; BVPP
PI BV99eii	Number of other vehicle users slightly injured per 100,000 population <i>(Data updated annually)</i>	94-98: 63.42 03/04: 60.22 04/05: 61.32				Safe	LBI; BVPP

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2006 – 2016

CHAPTER 7 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 The performance measures outlined in this chapter will guide implementation of this strategy and will allow Islington Council's performance to be benchmarked against other authorities and from year to year. The final six chapters of the strategy focus on specific geographical areas of Islington, starting with the A1 Borough Strategy.

