

# Chapter 5

## Delivery of LTP Strategies (Proforma B)

In this section, we summarise what has been delivered over the five years in three key delivery areas of the LTP.

- Public transport (including buses, rail, taxis, interchanges and information);
- Road safety; and
- Sustainability of transport policies (including air quality and climate change).

In addition, we have selected two further strategies which have been of most local importance:

- Travel Planning
- Social Inclusion.

Travel Planning is a key element of demand management and over the course of LTP1 a number of major developments have taken place in the City, each having the potential for significant impact on the transport network unless alternative modes of travel were developed and supported through the Travel Planning process. Fostering social inclusion is a high priority for the Council and it formed a core value of LTP1 (and has been developed further into LTP2).

For each of these strategies, we have provided evidence of expenditure and delivery under the LTP1 programme, a summary of the benefits and key outcomes, and where actual delivery has not matched our original intentions in the LTP, explanations of the reasons for divergence. Reference to specific local targets in our LTP is made where relevant.

Cross-references to the relevant sections of the LTP are provided for further details about our original plans. Descriptions of what was actually delivered are accompanied by an overall assessment of the extent to which the relevant aspects of the LTP strategy have been delivered,

e.g. 'strategy implemented broadly as planned', 'some elements of strategy not delivered', 'strategy implementation has exceeded expectations'.

Examples of specific schemes referred to in each of the strategy sections were described in more detail in Chapter 2.

**Table 5.1. Implementation of Public Transport Strategy (proforma B)**

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>1. Bus Strategy – sections 9.6.23-9.6.38 of LTP</p> <p>Substantial improvements to bus services and networks across the LTP area (see Sections 9.6.24 – 9.6.34 of LTP)</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>In total, SCC has spent some £3.5 million on over 500 bus stop upgrades, 28 bus priority schemes and over 30 improvements at key public transport interchanges. Stop upgrades have included new shelters, accessible kerbs, clearway markings and new real time displays. A new maintenance contract for all SCC owned shelters has also been introduced.</p> <p>The LTP expenditure has been matched by some £4.8 million for supported bus services (including Dial-a-Ride) and a further £6.9 million for concessionary fares. Amongst the services being supported are the free City Link and Loop buses running in the City Centre, a network of Nightbuses at weekends, and a local 'Hoppa' service in Bitterne. The City Link service not only receives financial support from SCC, but also from SWT, Red Funnel Ferries and Hammerson's (the owners of the West Quay Shopping Centre)</p> <p>A successful 'Kickstart' bid has enabled the service frequency of the Unilink service U1 to be increased from 20-15 minutes (this service links Southampton International Airport to the Central Station, the City Centre and the ferry terminals)</p> <p>In spite of this investment, the City has experienced a 10.5% drop in bus patronage over the period of the LTP (from 20.7 million journeys in 2000/2001 to 18.5 million journeys in 2005/2006) and we have thus failed to meet our target of 20.6 million journeys for that year.</p>	<p>The original proposal for the City Loop service was introduced as detailed in the LTP, but loadings were very disappointing and it was clear that it was not meeting a need. As a result, the service was discontinued once the original funding ran out, but a revised (free) service that links the Royal South Hants Hospital with car parks and the City Centre was introduced.</p> <p>Improvements to the interchange facilities in the City Centre (especially in Vincents Walk and Pound Tree Road) have not progressed as quickly as had been hoped, due to the levels of available funding and to the protracted consultation period with regard to the previous element of the City Centre strategy (which involved restricting traffic around the Bargate to buses only) A section of bus only road was introduced into Portland Terrace as outlined in the LTP, but practical issues in relation to enforcement led to its subsequent withdrawal, although this does not appear to have impacted adversely on service reliability.</p> <p>The start of the implementation of the real-time information system was delayed because of technical issues surrounding the software, but the funding was used to extend the programme of accessible kerbs and shelter upgrades.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>Evidence of the LTP investment made in bus priority measures delivering monitored benefits to bus passengers cost-effectively (see Sections 9.6.30-9.6.31 of LTP)</p>	<p>Nevertheless, survey results from 2003/2004 showed 57% of users to be 'satisfied' with bus services, compared to 27.4% in 2000/2001, suggesting we are on track to meet our original 2006/2007 target of 60%.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>SCC has implemented 28 bus priority schemes during the period of the LTP, most of them in the City Centre area in accordance with our policy of increasing priority for public transport and pedestrians within the area bounded by the Inner Ring Road. All have involved the re-allocation of road space, and in one case (around the Bargate) has involved the complete removal of all other traffic.</p> <p>Away from the City Centre, we have continued with a programme of installing selective bus detection at key traffic signals to enable buses to be given priority, and we have also invested in additional detectors at most other junctions to improve their performance at off-peak times (especially evenings when the SCOOT system is switched out)</p> <p>As part of our general approach to upgrading bus stops, we introduce clearway markings, which we then enforce with our own Parking Attendants as part of the DPE regime that we have in place.</p> <p>The new real-time bus information system is being installed in conjunction with our new smartcard system, enabling a two-way interface to be provided with the on-board ticket machines providing schedule adherence information to drivers. The real-time system also enables service punctuality to be monitored remotely by the operators, providing the potential for them to improve their service reliability.</p>	<p>As outlined above, one of the bus priority schemes we introduced (in Portland Terrace) was subsequently removed because of practical issues about enforceability and also because of a change in political views about its desirability.</p> <p>The scheme to restrict traffic around the Bargate to buses took far longer than anticipated to implement because of the extent of consultation required, especially with the operators and the taxi and private hire trade. This in turn has delayed the start of substantive works to the London Road scheme, although the traffic restrictions intended to assist bus operations were put in place during LTP1.</p> <p>Although we have DPE in place, the availability of Parking Attendants is not always sufficient to address all of the problems caused by illegal parking, and some locations require almost continual enforcement presence to prevent obstructions to bus operation being caused.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>Evidence of partnership with operators to promote and improve key services (see Sections 9.6.24-9.6.25 of LTP)</p> <p>Achievement of local outcome indicators (see Sections 4.4.3-4.4.4)</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>During the LTP period, we signed an umbrella Quality Bus Partnership agreement with all of the City's main operators and this has subsequently been followed by individual agreements on two route corridors.</p> <p>SCC had originally established the Southampton Area Public Transport Association (SAPTA) to deliver a high quality public transport network for the City. This continued to meet over the period of the LTP, but from March 2003 onwards, much of its role was taken on by Solent Transport, a more sub-regional grouping of local authorities, government agencies and public transport operators.</p> <p>A number of sub-groups have been established under the umbrella of Solent Transport, including ones concerned with integrated ticketing and with real-time systems. A joint project team to implement the City's smartcard project for concessionary fares has also been established and this includes representatives from all of the City's main bus operators.</p> <p><b>Some elements of strategy not delivered</b></p> <p>The key local targets were related to modal split, where we set a target of peak period public transport use of 26% by 2005-2006, and for off-peak public transport use of 19% by 2005-2006. The actual figures were 24% for peak period use and 19.8% for off-peak use. These results appear to show a pattern whereby the decline in peak period use has stabilised and off-peak use is showing a small but steady increase.</p> <p>The survey results from 2003-2004 showed that 45% of users were 'satisfied' with public transport information (up from 24.5% in 2000-2001 and on course to meet our target of 55% for 2006-2007)</p>	<p>The partnership agreements for the route corridors were not signed as soon as had originally been anticipated, although this has not had an adverse impact on services.</p> <p>There is some evidence that operators do not always comply with their obligations under the terms of the partnership(s) and there have been occasions when advance notice periods for service changes (especially de-registrations) have not been observed.</p> <p>It is clear in retrospect that the number of concessionary fares passes reported as being in use in 2000 was almost certainly over-estimated, due principally to the lack of an accurate recording system by the operator who administered the concessionary fares scheme on the Council's behalf. This situation has been rectified as a result of SCC taking over the administration as part of the change to smartcard use for the scheme.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>Substantial integration of conventional bus services with health and community transport and the voluntary sector (see Section 9.8)</p> <p>2. Implementation of the Passenger Rail Strategy (see Sections 9.6.13 – 9.6.22)</p>	<p>We also set targets for the number of concessionary fares passes issued, the number of Dial-a-Ride users and the number of passenger trips on supported bus services. In each case the target was simply to achieve an increase and although the number of concessionary fares passholders is now 10.7% lower than in 2000, it increased by 3.8% in 2005-2006, and the remaining two indicators both showed increases (by 6.2% and 115% respectively).</p> <p><b>Some elements of strategy not delivered</b></p> <p>It was originally our intention to put in place a Community Transport Brokerage scheme but, this has been delayed and we now plan to develop a revised scheme using funding secured through the Urban Bus Challenge. As noted earlier we continued to support the provision of a Dial-a-Ride scheme and have ensured that only low-floor vehicles are specified in tenders for supported services.</p> <p>Following a Best Value Review of the Use of Transport during 2005 we have set up a new Transport Co-ordination Unit (TCU). The TCU has combined the previously disparate functions of planning, funding and delivery of transport services for Education and Social Care. This has already resulted in considerable efficiencies and it is hoped that £363,000 will be saved in 2006-2007 alone.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>Over the period of LTP1, there has been a massive 25% increase in the number of passengers using the main Central Rail Station (up from four million to five million per annum). A series of improvements have taken place here to make the travelling environment more pleasant for passengers and these are fully covered in section 4 (Public Transport Interchanges).</p>	<p>The lack of progress in establishing a Brokerage was hampered by a lack of funding and available staff resources. Urban Bus Challenge funding is now being actively considered for the development of an alternative scheme.</p> <p>We did not take forward the proposed reopening of the Eastern Docks line to regular passenger traffic and the associated creation of a new station near Canute Road. Following further consideration and discussion with ABP, Network Rail and the TOC's we do not intend to pursue this scheme any further.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>3. Role of taxis and private hire vehicles (see Sections 9.6.42 – 9.6.45)</p> <p>4. Public Transport Interchanges (see Section 9.7)</p>	<p>Additionally, waiting shelters have been replaced at three of the City's remaining seven (suburban) rail stations and all have been subject to varying levels of refurbishment by South West Trains (upgraded lighting, repainting, new signing systems etc).</p> <p>It is pleasing to report that the rail station at Chandlers Ford re-opened as an early initiative of the Solent Transport Partnership, Hampshire County Council and SWT. Regular services provide a valuable link between Southampton, Chandlers Ford, Romsey and Eastleigh.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>A successful Taxi quality partnership was introduced which included the standardisation of vehicle colour and appearance. Taxis are allowed to use all bus lanes throughout the City, seven new taxi ranks were established, two innovative taxi corrals were installed and all new taxi licenses required the use of DDA compliant vehicles.</p> <p><b>Some elements of strategy not delivered</b></p> <p>We have worked closely with South West Trains to substantially upgrade the main Central Station. Funding has been provided to install greatly improved waiting facilities on the main northbound platform and stainless steel cycle stands have also been installed on this platform and the main southbound platform. We led work on a major, joint-funded project (SCC, SWT and SEEDA through AIF) that has resulted in high-quality new streetlighting (including feature columns on the main City Centre – station pedestrian link), pedestrian fingerpost signing and cycle parking being provided on the approaches and at the main northbound entrance to the station. The next stage of the project (nearing completion) is</p>	<p>The proposed port extension at Dibden Bay failed to gain approval and as a consequence the suggested reopening of the Fawley branch line to passenger traffic did not take place. However, given continued growth in the Waterside communities this remains a key sub-regional priority and is highlighted as such in the adopted Solent Transport Strategy (LTP2).</p> <p>The major redevelopment of the Central Rail Station has yet to come to fruition. A detailed study has been undertaken in conjunction with Network Rail and other potential development partners to identify the possible options for such a scheme.</p> <p>While some improvements have been undertaken at Town Quay for ferry users, we have not yet been able to make the more substantial provision originally envisaged particularly, in respect of disabled passengers.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>5. Public Transport Information improvements (see Sections 9.65 – 9.68)</p>	<p>the construction of a new entrance canopy and concourse at the northbound side.</p> <p>Improved pedestrian links have been provided from the City Centre to the main Isle of Wight ferry terminal in the form of a signal controlled crossing, designed to blend in with the Old Town Conservation Area (within which it partly sits).</p> <p>New bus facilities have been installed as part of major Town and District Centre upgrades at Shirley and Portswood – shelters, information poles and BDIS screens. Kickstart funding has been used by Uni-link to increase the frequency of the U1 service that serves Southampton Airport, greatly improving surface access.</p> <p>We have (with Hampshire County Council) continued to support the operation of the Hythe Ferry which as well as providing a vital public transport link to the Waterside Communities, also serves as a key element of National Cycle Network route 2. The free City Link bus service provides an excellent link between the ferry terminal at Town Quay and the Central Rail Station (via the main City Centre retail core).</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>We have made a concerted effort to effect a step-change in the provision of public transport information. A bus stop ID system has been introduced into the City Centre, Shirley Town Centre and at Lords Hill District Centre. Integrated public transport maps are produced and widely distributed every year – during the life of LTP1 some 245,000 were given out to passengers. The map is also available on our website. We are members of South West Traveline and 1,625 queries on average are made every day. A City wide Stopwatch system has been successfully rolled out and gives the travelling public</p>	<p>While some modest reconfiguration and upgrading was made to the major bus interchange at Vincents Walk and Pound Tree Road as part of the Lottery-funded Central Parks Refurbishment project we have still to implement the more fundamental rearrangement of facilities originally planned. These are being looked at afresh as part of LTP2 work on the future transport needs of the City Centre.</p> <p>The Triplanner terminals which were installed as part of an EU funded project have subsequently been removed as they proved to be of limited value and required a disproportionate maintenance effort.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
	<p>real time information that assists in journey planning. BDIS screens have been installed in the City Centre, at key District Centres, the Southampton General Hospital, the ferry terminal and the Central Rail Station (these also display real time information).</p> <p>A standard, easy to read format has been devised for bus timetables and this has initially been installed at City Centre stops, followed by key District Centres. 80 Trueform bus stop poles have been installed City wide – these are high quality pieces of street furniture that incorporate service numbers, real time displays and timetable information and are prominently marked 'City of Southampton'.</p>	
<p><b>Table 5.2 Implementation of Road Safety Strategy</b></p>		
<p>1. Progress on local road casualty reduction targets up to 2005 (see Sections 9.10.1 – 9.10.16)</p>	<p><b>Some elements of strategy not delivered</b></p> <p>During LTP1, we delivered some 98 local safety schemes at a total cost of £2.75 million. This was in broadly in line with our originally planned delivery and the total was made up of 13 traffic calming schemes and 85 other safety schemes. We also implemented 55 Safer Routes to Schools schemes and 43 new formal pedestrian crossing facilities, funded from our Sustainable Travel budget.</p> <p>In spite of this level of investment, we are still not 'on track' to meet our 2010 target for a 40% reduction in the overall number of KSI casualties, compared to the 1994-8 average. Our baseline figure for those years was 119 and the average for the three years 2003-2005 was 103.7, a reduction of some 13% but not sufficient to put us on track for our 2010 target.</p>	<p>It was always going to be challenging to achieve the target 40% reduction in Overall KSI's because of the level of success that we had achieved against the first round of national casualty reduction targets (where we achieved a 65% reduction against the national target of 33%). This was highlighted in the LTP at section 9.10.5 where it was stated that, in reference to the previous targets, 'it can be seen that there has been a much greater reduction in the number of reported injury casualties in the City compared to the national situation.....Therefore, in future, in the City it is likely to be much more difficult to identify sites with a significant number of fatal/serious crashes amenable to the application of remedial treatment than has been the case in the past.' This has proved to be the case, where in spite of strenuous efforts and rigorous analysis, we have to date only achieved a further 13% reduction. As a consequence, we</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>2. Contribution of partners to delivery (see Sections 7.9.3, 9.10.7 and 9.10.12)</p>	<p>We are, however, 'on track' to meet our target for Child KSI's, to reduce these by 50% by 2010 against the 1994-1998 baseline. Our baseline figure was 23 casualties and the 2003-2005 average was 17.7 (a reduction of 23%) with the 2005 figure of 16 casualties being one better than the milestone target for the year of 17.</p> <p>We are also 'on track' with regard to slight injury accident casualties. In fact, we have already achieved our original LTP1 target of a 10% reduction by 2010 and as a consequence have set a more stretching target in LTP2. Our baseline figure was 1002 casualties and our average for 2003-2005 was 861, a reduction of some 14%. The figure for 2005 was 767 compared to our milestone target of 865.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned with some positive outcomes</b></p> <p>The City has been active in working in partnership to help deliver improved road safety. Section 7.9.3 of the LTP stated 'The City Council strongly believes that a multi-agency approach to road safety represents the most effective way of making progress.....' and this has been a core value during LTP1.</p> <p>The City was a founder member of the Hampshire Safety Camera Partnership which is now in its fourth year of operation. The partnership (with Hampshire Constabulary and the other highway authorities in the County) has been instrumental in the erection of speed and red light cameras in the City, and early indications suggest that some very positive results are being obtained. In the first year of camera deployment on the main Western Approach route, the number of KSI's reduced from ten to just one.</p>	<p>have revised our 2010 target for overall KSI's in LTP2 to a level which we believe to be more realistic.</p> <p>As part of our attempts to achieve our targets, we allocated more LTP funding to Road Safety measures than originally proposed in the LTP, particularly in the last three years where we spent over £150,000 more than profiled.</p> <p>Whilst the level of car occupant KSI casualties is now at an historic low, we are still experiencing a higher than average level of pedestrian casualties and this is an area to which we have given increasing priority in recent years, by providing greater numbers of crossings, increasing the amount of pedestrianised area, and introducing 20mph zones.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>3. Impact of the five-year programme of local safety schemes (see Sections 9.10.15-9.10.16)</p> <p>4. Strong and systematic application of the redesign of roads, speed limits and supporting signing and road engineering measures (see Sections 7.11.6-7.11.7)</p>	<p>The City is a member of the Strategic Casualty Reduction Partnership for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, which, amongst other things, is scheduled to become the successor body to the Camera Partnership, and the City is also represented on the Southampton Accident Prevention Group (a Health Service led group which focuses in particular on preventing accidents involving children and older people).</p> <p>The Council has also developed and adopted a City Safety Strategy which includes a section on the contribution that improved road safety makes to the overall safety of the City.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned with some positive outcomes</b></p> <p>We have consistently monitored the performance of those safety schemes that we have implemented to enable us to assess their effectiveness in helping us to meet our road safety targets. Table 4.1 sets out how well the schemes we have introduced have done in terms of casualty savings.</p> <p><b>Some elements of strategy not delivered</b></p> <p>For the past 25 years, we have maintained a database of injury accidents which is used to identify and then prioritise our road safety schemes. In line with the policies in the LTP, we have taken a rigorous approach to investment prioritisation based on the reported injury accident record for the location or area and our analysis of the underlying pattern of accidents.</p> <p>This analysis includes a review of all significant factors, such as time of day, road condition, the parties involved, vehicle speeds, signing and lighting, and the Police observations</p>	<p>As already outlined, despite this rigorous approach to analysis, we are still not 'on track' to achieve our original 2010 targets for overall KSI reduction. In light of the increasing difficult being experienced in achieving further reduction in the level of KSI's, we are working with the Transportation Research Group at the University of Southampton to try to identify any ways in which our analytical methods might be improved, or if there are any areas of investigation that we are failing to identify.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that at least part of the</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>5. Resources, delivery and impact of our Education, Training and Publicity (ETP) measures (see Sections 9.10.9 – 9.10.14)</p>	<p>about the primary cause(s) of the accident.</p> <p>As predicted in our LTP, because of the success of this approach in the past, it has proved more difficult to identify sites likely to prove amenable to treatment and, increasingly, our efforts have focused on area-wide schemes that address a more dispersed pattern of accidents. This has included the implementation of our first Home Zone, a scheme in a residential area on the edge of the City Centre, where the introduction of a 20mph zone has been allied to a comprehensive re-modelling of the street scene.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned with positive outcomes</b></p> <p>During LTP1 we have invested £0.67 million in our Road Safety ETP strategy. Our annual revenue budget is currently some £130,000, reflecting the high degree of importance placed on this activity by Members.</p> <p>One of the more important initiatives undertaken during LTP1 was the creation of a new post of School Crossing Patrol Co-ordinator and the allocation of this post to the Sustainable Travel Team for line management purposes (although the post is funded from Children’s Services budgets). As far as the Council was concerned, this was a new approach to the overall running of the School Crossing Patrol Service which had historically lacked a central focus and, amongst other things, it has enabled a more integrated approach to be taken to the development of School Travel Plans.</p> <p>We have worked with children of all age groups to improve road safety. Amongst the broad range of programmes offered, some of the more noteworthy were:</p>	<p>difficulty in achieving our 2010 targets is a direct result of our level of achievement against the original year 2000 target, where the challenge was to achieve a one-third reduction in KSI casualties, based on the average for the years 1981-1985, and we actually managed to achieve a two-thirds reduction, i.e. double the target. One of the implications of this was that, by the time the new targets were established, we had already identified (and treated) many of the sites where defined patterns of accidents were occurring, leaving a much more dispersed series of incidents to be addressed.</p> <p>The strategy outlined in the LTP has been delivered broadly as planned and the indicators appear to show positive outcomes. It is somewhat disappointing to note, however, that although the overall staffing levels of the team dealing with road safety education and training and with school travel plans has increased over the period of the LTP, there has been a reduction in the number of dedicated road safety education officers, which has impacted on the range of training that can be delivered, albeit this does not appear at present to have had an adverse impact on our casualty figures.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footsteps training for pre-school children and parents</li> <li>• Cycle training for Year 6 children</li> <li>• Preparation and distribution of 'Moving On' packs to Year 6 children about to move to secondary school (containing details of walking and cycle routes, public transport timetables etc)</li> <li>• Advanced cycle training for secondary school children</li> <li>• Theatre in Education presentations to Years 10 and 11 (with a particular focus on pre-driver education)</li> </ul> <p>We have also continued to offer a structured programme of more traditional road safety education in Primary Schools.</p> <p>Powered Two Wheeler (PTW) use has increased dramatically across the City and this has been reflected in a higher level of incidents particularly in respect of larger motorcycles. Accordingly, we have continued to work closely with Hampshire Constabulary and HCC in the delivery of the Edge 44 initiative which encourages riders to adopt more appropriate habits in the relative safety of an observed environment.</p> <p>We have continued to support national campaigns by linking them to local effort wherever appropriate, thereby offering greater dissemination of these key safety messages e.g. display of THINK slogans on some of our VMS signing.</p> <p>It is encouraging to note that this effort in road safety education, training and publicity appears to be paying off, in that we are 'on track' to achieve our target 50% reduction in Child KSI's by 2010.</p>	

**Table 5.3 Implementation of Sustainable Transport Strategy**

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>1. Airport surface access (see Sections 9.6.46 – 9.6.49)</p> <p>2. Co-ordination with Air Quality Action Plan and action on noise (Sections 11.2.1 – 11.2.5 for air quality and 11.4.1 – 11.4.3 for noise)</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>Although Southampton International Airport is located just outside the City boundary (in Eastleigh Borough Council's area), good transport links to and from the City are important, as the airport is seen as providing support to the City's economic development policies.</p> <p>The City has continued with its membership of the Southampton Airport Joint Consultative Group and has continued to promote better access to the airport, especially by public transport, over the period of the LTP. In particular, and most recently, it promoted a successful 'Kickstart' bid for funding to enable the increase in frequency of the Unilink U1 service that links the airport to the University, City Centre, Central Station and ferry terminal. This now operates at a 15 minute frequency throughout the day.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>During the period of the LTP, a network of air quality monitoring sites was established and a detailed assessment of air quality in the City was undertaken by consultants.</p> <p>The LTP reported that Stage 2 of the Air Quality Review and Assessment for the City had identified that there was a risk</p>	<p>During the course of the LTP, there has been a significant increase in the number of passengers passing through the airport, mainly due to the rise in the number of low-cost airlines using it. This has resulted in a shift in emphasis from being a mainly business-orientated airport to being (at least) equally leisure-based. This, in turn, has meant that customers are increasingly drawn from a wider geographic area and although some of these arrive by train (taking advantage of the shortest train-to-terminal transfer of any UK airport) it is disappointing that more bus and coach services do not currently serve the airport, with the result that there is an increasing level of car travel to and from it.</p> <p>This puts added pressure on to Junction 5 of the M27, where the airport traffic joins the strategic highway network and where it also conflicts with traffic on the A335 travelling between Eastleigh and Southampton. This has particular implications for the future in that one of the largest potential employment sites in South Hampshire is located immediately to the north of the airport and this is expected to provide a large number of jobs for Southampton residents; increased congestion at Junction 5 exacerbated by increased airport traffic will have severe implications for accessibility to this site.</p> <p>The LTP described the aim to disseminate air quality information through the ROMANSE traffic information systems. This has yet to be achieved; although we now have a consistent flow of air quality information, there is currently no link to the ROMANSE control centre and there has yet to be clarification about the media through which the information</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>3. Action on Climate Change (see Sections 11.3.1 – 11.3.3)</p>	<p>that PM10 and NO2 levels could exceed recommended levels in 2005. In practice, PM10 levels did not but, as set out in LTP2, six Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA's) were declared in 2005, all on the basis of exceedance of recommended levels of NO2 and all as a result of traffic emissions. Work has been started on the Action Plans for these areas and the overall Action Plan was appended to LTP2 at Appendix 3.</p> <p>During LTP1, a number of major carriageway re-surfacing schemes in residential areas were undertaken using SMA surfacing which is known to reduce traffic noise, and the feedback from residents to these schemes was extremely positive. Measurements on the Bassett Avenue scheme indicated that a reduction of as much as 3db(A) was achieved.</p> <p>However, as noted in the Scoping Report for the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for LTP2, the City continues to receive few complaints about traffic noise, the biggest cause of complaint about noise being in relation to air traffic to and from Southampton Airport. In response to this, the Airport has introduced a new pattern of flight paths into and out of the Airport designed to minimise the amount of flying over built-up areas of the City, and the effectiveness of these is currently being assessed.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented with positive outcomes</b></p> <p>The City Council has developed and adopted (in 2004) a Climate Change and Air Quality Strategy and was one of the first local authorities in the country to appoint a Climate Change Officer.</p> <p>The Climate Change strategy considers the relationship between air quality and climate change and sets out how</p>	<p>would be disseminated and how it would be used.</p> <p>As noted in LTP2 (section 3.12), a noise map of the City is yet to be produced, but it is expected that a road traffic noise map will be produced during the period of LTP2 as part of the National Ambient Noise Strategy.</p> <p>As noted in the previous section ,it is disappointing to note that, although we appear to have been successful in restraining overall traffic growth in the City over the period of the LTP, we have still had to declare six AQMA's as a result of traffic emissions. Whilst these AQMA's are very localised, they are located at points in the City's strategic road network that are likely to make effective short-term solutions difficult to</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>4. Sustainable Distribution (see Sections 7.8.1 – 7.8.3 and 9.9.1 – 9.9.26)</p>	<p>the City will be prepared to take the appropriate actions to achieve a 20% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2010. In particular, the City is committed to reducing the level of CO2 emissions (by 90,000 tonnes per year) and, given that road transport is estimated to contribute almost a quarter of all CO2 emissions in the City, the strategy makes clear that efforts to restrain traffic growth are likely to prove beneficial. It is thus pleasing to note that there has been virtually no growth in overall traffic levels in the City (as measured by our annual 12-hour counts) over the past ten years (see Appendix 2).</p> <p>It was noted that the policies in the LTP would promote more sustainable travel choices and so reduce the usage of fossil fuels. The evidence of our modal split surveys, cycle surveys and 12-hour traffic counts suggest that the LTP has been reasonably successful in this respect and, coupled with the increasing efficiency of the latest generation of vehicle engines, this can be expected to have resulted in reduced overall consumption of fossil fuels.</p> <p>We have also introduced solar powered equipment to help reduce our energy consumption (and hence reduce fossil fuel use). Ten bus shelters have so far been fitted with solar-powered lighting as the first phase of a comprehensive programme, and most of our on-street parking machines have recently been replaced with 234 new solar-powered ones (representing 94% of the installations).</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>Freight is an important element of the City's economy and the promotion of sustainable distribution has been a key theme of the LTP (and is continued in LTP2)</p>	<p>identify, but given the link between air quality and climate change, it is imperative to try to ensure that these areas can eventually be 'undeclared'.</p> <p>Whilst there has been clear progress over the period of the LTP in terms of the development of the freight distribution network, the refusal of planning consent for the Port expansion at Dibden Bay has necessitated a review of freight</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
	<p>The LTP outlined the establishment of a Freight Quality Partnership (FQP) for the City and this has met on an infrequent but regular basis over the course of LTP1 to discuss matters of common concern with regard to freight movement. One of the key outcomes from this group was the development and implementation of the City Centre service area signing system, designed to make it easier for delivery drivers to find their destinations without undertaking wasted mileage. This scheme was accompanied by the publication of an advisory leaflet distributed to all City centre businesses for them to provide to their suppliers.</p> <p>The FQP also reviewed the City's strategic and local lorry route network as set out in the LTP and concluded that it was still relevant to current circumstances, with the result that it has been continued into LTP2 (Map 8)</p> <p>Whilst the FQP has tended to focus on road transport, we have also been active in promoting freight on rail. In particular we have championed the need for the Southampton-West Midlands rail gauge enhancement scheme and are members of the project team for the scheme (we were also instrumental in helping to secure European funding through the IMPACTE project to enable the final stage of design work for the scheme to be undertaken)</p> <p>ABP (the owners of the Port of Southampton) have been instrumental in encouraging the growth of 'feeder' – the trans-shipment of containers (especially) to and from smaller vessels and then distribution to other UK ports by short-sea shipping rather than by road or rail. At present, some 5% of the volume handled through the Port is feeder traffic.</p>	<p>access to the Port. It is clear that the existing network will now have to handle much greater volumes of freight traffic than had originally been envisaged as a direct result of the Port expanding its business on the existing site, and this is certain to have implications for access both by road and rail.</p> <p>One of the issues outlined in the LTP that could have proved beneficial was the possible provision of a no-car lane from the southern end of the M271 to give priority access to Dock Gates 20 and 10 (as well as the City Centre) but a thorough investigation of this concept concluded that there were overriding road safety concerns that could not be overcome (due to the short distance between the Redbridge and Millbrook Flyovers and the high volumes of weaving traffic) and this has therefore not been progressed further.</p> <p>The City has also suffered from the loss of its only strategic lorry park, after the owners found that it was no longer a viable proposition and it was sold for redevelopment for housing. The nature of much of the road traffic to the Port means that there are large numbers of long-distance vehicles coming to the City, but although the Council's policy is to work with the private sector to identify a new site for a strategic lorry park, there seems little likelihood at present of any private sector interest.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
	<p>It should also be noted that Southampton Container Terminals (SCT) who manage the container port, have introduced a new computerised container handling system that has made for much more efficient working and greatly reduced turn round times for drivers delivering and/or collecting containers. This, in turn, has spread the load on the surrounding strategic road network, with particular benefits at peak periods.</p>	
<p><b>Table 5.4 Implementation of Workplace Travel Plan Strategy</b></p>		
<p>1. Assessment of baseline situation, setting targets and monitoring progress (see Sections 9.12.1 – 9.12.5)</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned with positive outcomes</b></p> <p>The LTP outlined the existence of a Green Transport Plan Working Group to act as a forum where employers could share good practice in relation to travel planning and could work together to obtain benefits for their staff. We have continued to work with this group and it has now expanded and split to become two separate, geographically-based groups, one in the City Centre area and the other covering the north and west of the City.</p> <p>At the start of the LTP period, work was done by the group to assess the overall situation and as a result, it was decided to set a target of 50% of the 14 largest organisations in the City having a travel plan in place by 2003 and this was achieved (2003 APR refers). This included major travel plans for the University of Southampton and for the NHS Trust at both Southampton General and Royal South Hants Hospitals.</p> <p>Subsequently, major travel plans have also been put in place for the West Quay Retail Shopping Centre and for the St</p>	<p>Whilst progress in this area is generally felt to have been good, there remain some aspects where it has not been as rapid or as effective as had originally been anticipated. There has been slower progress than expected in the negotiation of bulk discounts for employees; this had been seen as one of the more immediate benefits expected to accrue from the establishment of the travel plan groupings, but concerns about the implications of the competition regulations and reservations about reimbursement mechanisms, especially on the part of smaller public transport operators, led to a protracted process that is only now being resolved.</p> <p>A delay in the adoption of the City's own Staff Travel Plan (see below) also contributed to some of the expected elements of that plan not being introduced as soon as had been anticipated, although the plan is now in place (having been adopted in April 2005) and the site-specific plans that will flow from this umbrella plan are now being developed.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
	<p>Mary's Football Stadium (a 32,600-seater stadium with no dedicated car parking provision at all)</p> <p>Progress on the development of green travel plans has been generally good and there is substantial evidence pointing to the success of them at an overall level. Some of the key pointers are the 12-hour traffic counts and the annual modal split surveys, both of which indicate that conditions now are broadly similar to five years ago, even though in the meantime the West Quay Shopping Centre has opened (attracting some 15 million visitors each year), the Stadium has opened (attracting average crowds of around 30,000 for each match) and throughput at the General Hospital has virtually doubled.</p> <p>As a consequence of having a dedicated Travel Plan Officer in post from early 2004 onwards, we set a stretched target of having ten of the 14 travel plans in place by 2005-2006 and this has also been achieved. For LTP2, we have modified the form of the target to show coverage of the total City workforce (35% by 2010-2011, based on the 2004-2005 level of 24.1%)</p> <p>It is now a standard requirement as part of the City Council's planning process that any new retail, employment or education development has to have an agreed travel plan in place before the start of occupation. These generally have targets related to modal share, with the key one being to reduce the amount of single-occupancy car travel.</p> <p>Progress monitoring is carried out through the groups, with employers reporting on periodic surveys of employees and their travel modes.</p>	

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>2. Evidence of partnerships with other organisations (see Sections 9.12.2 and 9.12.4 – 9.12.5)</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned with some positive outcomes</b></p> <p>The previous section outlined the existence of a two networks of travel planning organisations; those represented include the NHS Trust, the University of Southampton, Ordnance Survey, HM Customs and Excise, Southampton FC, West Quay, etc, but there are other partnerships looking at the benefits to be gained from travel planning. One of the key ones is the Healthy City Partnership (one of the sub-groups of the Southampton Partnership) which brings together health promotion staff from both the PCT and the City Council. Early in its existence, this group identified the link between sustainable travel and healthy lifestyles and as a result, staff from the transport division were invited to join the partnership to create the link between sustainable travel (including travel planning) and health improvement.</p> <p>There has been extensive dialogue with bus operators about the possible introduction of reduced price tickets for employees (based on bulk purchase) and these are now close to fruition. Working with our partners in Solent transport, there have also been negotiations to try to extend the coverage of the Solent Travelcard (see Appendix 1) to rail operators, the travelcard being seen as the platform on which an employee concession ticket would be based.</p> <p>We have also continued our membership of the Travelwise organisation and have promoted the use of Hampshire County Council's Hants Car-Share scheme.</p>	<p>As outlined above, progress has not been as rapid as hoped with regard to the introduction of concessionary tickets for employees, although it is now hoped that the obstacles have been overcome and that introduction will happen in the near future.</p> <p>There has also been some reluctance on the part of some employers to reduce the amount of on-site car parking where this has been required as part of a planning consent linked to the development of a travel plan. It is fair to say that this reflects the attitude of some of the affected staff who continue to use their cars to commute to workplaces, even where there is no longer any parking provision for them. The end result of this is that the Council is now having to consider the introduction of additional waiting restrictions in some adjacent residential areas.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>3. Integration with other policies and activities (see Section 9.12.3)</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned</b></p> <p>As outlined above, work on developing travel plans is now closely aligned with the agenda to improve health through the promotion of more active lifestyles (set out in more detail in the Active Travel Plan at Appendix 2 of LTP2). One of the key initiatives proposed in LTP2 is the development of 'walk-to-work' routes, especially around the City Centre area and around district centres, and these will be promoted through the travel planning network.</p> <p>Work on the City Council's own travel plan is increasingly linked to the Improvement Plan that was developed following the Best Value Review of the Council's Use of Transport, carried out in early 2005. Amongst other things, this seeks to reduce the amount of car mileage undertaken by Council staff, both to and from work and at work, and the initiatives of the travel plan have a clear role to play in helping to achieve the targets of the Best Value Improvement Plan.</p> <p>There is also a linkage with the development of school travel plans (and the staff dealing with the topics are both in the same team to make communication that much more straightforward) One of the main areas is the potential dual role of 'walk-to-work' routes as key 'walk-to-school' routes as well and the opportunities for this are currently being researched.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned with some positive outcomes</b></p>	<p>For a variety of reasons, we have not engaged as much with wider transport awareness campaigns as was envisaged when LTP1 was published. Although we have retained our membership of Travelwise, we have tended to undertake our own promotional activities, albeit often within the framework of other initiatives (eg organising a Commuter Challenge as part of Sustainable Travel month) As a result, we have not adopted a policy of roadside advertising for campaigns, relying instead on the promotional value of local events to sustain the messages.</p> <p>This general approach is being reviewed and it may be that during the course of LTP2, we do become more involved with national campaigns.</p>
<p>4. City Council Travel Plan (see Section 9.12.1)</p>	<p>Although it took considerably longer than anticipated at the time the LTP was published, the City Council adopted its own travel plan in April 2005 and many of the key elements</p>	<p>The main issue here has been the rate of progress with the adoption of the Plan. Primarily, this was due to a lack of staff resources to progress it during the early days of the LTP; it has</p>

<b>Delivery Benchmark</b>	<b>What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)</b>	<b>Explanations for changes to what was planned</b>
	<p>of this are already in place.</p> <p>The main target for the plan is to achieve a modal shift in journeys to work and at work by Council staff by single-occupancy vehicle from 51% in 2005 to 36% by 2010. There are also subsidiary targets to reduce the amount of staff mileage being undertaken that arise from the Best Value Review of the Council's Use of Transport.</p> <p>Since the LTP was published, a number of new initiatives over and above those described in Section 9.12.1 have been put in place, including an increase in the amount and location of secure cycle parking facilities, the introduction of a 'Bike Doctor' scheme, the promotion of the Hants Car-Share scheme (outlined above) and the appointment of a Personal Journey Planner post to offer assistance to staff in making journeys either at work or to and from work. Car parking charges for staff have also been increased.</p> <p>More recently, we have concluded negotiations for the introduction of a car club into the City Centre as part of the overall travel plan and the City Council will be a member of the scheme, with individual staff members being able to join on a personal basis if they should wish.</p> <p>Also, as outlined above, we are close to concluding negotiations for a discounted bus (and possibly rail) ticket, valid on all services in the South Hampshire area.</p>	<p>only been since early 2004 that we have had a Workplace Travel Plan Officer in post.</p> <p>This has also impacted on the development of the site-specific plans that will be produced under the umbrella of the overall plan. The City has a large number of diverse workplaces, with staff that have to work under a variety of conditions and each one has its own particular problems to be addressed. Once the current phase of negotiations for the introduction of 'common products' is completed, it is intended to develop these with the twin objectives of meeting the targets of both the Travel Plan and the Improvement Plan arising from the Best Value Review.</p>

**Table 5.5 Implementation of Social Inclusion Strategy**

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>1. Commitment to meeting needs of disabled people and different social groups (see Sections 7.3, 9.3 and 9.8)</p>	<p><b>Strategy Implemented broadly as planned with positive outcomes</b></p> <p>Addressing social inclusion was a core value of the LTP, reflecting the Council's Priorities to 'Tackle Deprivation and Inequalities' and 'Promote Independent Living'. This commitment has been carried through into LTP2 and Section 5.5.4.5.5 of that document sets out the policy approach to providing accessibility for disabled road users. More generally, Section 5.5.4 describes how improvements to accessibility contribute directly towards social inclusion.</p> <p>Over the course of the LTP, we consulted with, and directly involved, a wide range of groups including those representing disabled people (Southampton Action for Access, Southampton Centre for Independent Living), older people (the Later Years Partnership), younger people (Southampton Youth Parliament), people with learning difficulties (the City Council's Valuing People team) and ethnic minority groups (through Community Action Forums and Neighbourhood Partnerships) All of these groups were also involved with the production of LTP2.</p> <p>Staff have been involved in a series of disability awareness seminars and have accompanied disabled road users on journeys to gain a better understanding of the particular problems faced by people with specific disabilities. Disabled users have also been involved in post-opening audits of schemes to identify problems that may have inadvertently been created. New-build schemes have been designed to accord with the principles of the Council's policy document 'Women and the Environment' which sets out good design practice to provide assistance to women.</p>	<p>Although we believe that we have managed to establish dialogue with most groups in the City, there remain those 'hard-to reach' groups that are, by definition, the most difficult to contact. We have recently been trying to address this problem as part of our work on the Equality Standard and in our INRA assessment, we have included the need to identify and contact such groups and we are working with colleagues in the Council's Community Involvement service to do this.</p> <p>We have also encountered difficulties that result from the (often) conflicting requirements of the various disabled groups. This can lead to having to compromise on ideal requirements, with some schemes having to be modified once implemented to address problems caused to one group resulting from genuine attempts to meet the needs of another.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>2. Evidence of involvement of representatives of different groups (see Section 7.3.2)</p> <p>3. Evidence of co-operation and partnerships with transport providers (including the community transport sector) (see Section 9.8.1 – 9.8.2)</p>	<p>In an attempt to increase the level of staying-on to post-16 education, the Council introduced a concessionary bus pass for those students aged 16-19 in receipt of EMA., to ensure they were not prevented from accessing further education opportunities for reasons of travel costs.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned with some positive outcomes</b></p> <p>As outlined above, it has always been our policy to involve representatives of all affected groups, not only when schemes are developed, but also post-opening to learn where there may still be opportunity for improvement.</p> <p>We have a continuing dialogue with many of the groups that is not restricted solely to discussion about specifics, but which covers day-to-day issues as well (eg a Transport subgroup of the Later Years Partnership has been set up to discuss matters of concern to older people, and the Accessibility Forum, set up as part of the LTP2 process, includes representatives from Children's Services, the PCT and the NHS Trust)</p> <p>The Southampton Bus User Group (which we co-ordinate) also contains representatives from many other organisations and meets twice-yearly to discuss matters of concern directly with the operators.</p> <p><b>Some elements of strategy not delivered</b></p> <p>Much of the effort in LTP1 was directed towards making the public transport network more accessible, both in terms of mainstream public transport and community transport.</p> <p>As described in the earlier section on Public Transport, we</p>	<p>One area where there has been less success than elsewhere is with regard to the extension of the successful Shopmobility scheme. The LTP stated that, in partnership with other organisations, we would examine the potential for the scheme to be extended to district shopping centres. This was done and the potential for a scheme in the Shirley District Centre was identified.</p> <p>A scheme that was a satellite of the City Centre scheme was introduced, operating on two days a week, but the land from which the scheme was operating formed part of the car park to a re-built supermarket and the company decided that they were not prepared to give the land over on a permanent basis and in spite of efforts to find an alternative site, this was not possible and the scheme was forced to close.</p> <p>This is an area where, in spite of a number of successes, there remain a number of initiatives that have yet to come to fruition. One of the most significant is that of establishing a community transport brokerage scheme. It has been recognised for some time that there is a substantial resource in</p>

<b>Delivery Benchmark</b>	<b>What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)</b>	<b>Explanations for changes to what was planned</b>
	<p>have invested heavily in making the bus network more accessible, with over 400 of the City's bus stops now having accessible kerbs in place. These not only benefit disabled people but they also provide a useful facility for mothers with buggies who are able to utilise the low-floor buses much more readily. The City's Bus Quality Partnership commits operators and the City Council to work together to make the bus network more accessible and the operators have responded to the City's investment by increasing the numbers of low-floor vehicles in use. 55% of buses operating regularly in the City are now low-floor. To ensure that the maximum benefit is derived from the investment, we also require that all supported services on core routes are provided by low-floor buses.</p> <p>We have continued to offer a concessionary fares scheme that is better than the statutory minimum and with the recent move towards free travel, we have extended the area of entitlement to include several destinations just outside the City boundary that people had told us were important (eg Moor Green Hospital in Eastleigh BC area where a large number of older people go to receive out-patient treatment). The City's scheme was also modified in terms of the reimbursement calculations, but after discussions with the operators, they have agreed to operate it under the new terms.</p> <p>We have continued to support a Dial-a-Ride scheme for those people not able to access mainstream public transport. This is operated on behalf of the Council by SCA Community Services under the terms of a service level agreement. During 2005-2006, this three-bus service carried some 14,500 passengers and it was fully booked on most days.</p>	<p>the City in the form of a large number of minibuses, many of which remain idle for much of the week. If some form of central co-ordination point could be established, the potential exists to benefit the local communities by enabling them to access cheaper and more flexible transport.</p> <p>There is now a prospect that this may be achieved using funding obtained by the Council through the Urban Bus Challenge; this funding was originally intended to provide a flexible scheduled service to several of the City's Priority Neighbourhoods where low incomes and poor accessibility had combined to prevent residents fulfilling their potential. Unfortunately, a series of events occurred that prevented this original proposal from being brought to fruition and in the interim, further work with the regeneration boards for the areas involved identified that a different form of provision had become more appropriate. It is hoped that this different form of provision, based around an extension of the Dial-a-Ride service as the first phase of a project that will also create a community transport brokerage scheme, can be started during the autumn of 2006.</p> <p>For reasons of affordability, the Council has also not yet been able to extend its concessionary fares scheme to enable unlimited cross-boundary journeys to be made. This remains a commitment in LTP2, but without significant extra funding becoming available, it is unlikely that it can be achieved in advance of the proposed national scheme in 2008.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>4. Targets for improving access for disabled people (see Section 4.4.3)</p>	<p>During the period of the LTP, we worked with the operators to introduce a network of Nightbuses to support the night-time economy and help to disperse the large numbers of revellers who come to the City Centre at weekends. This has included the provision of security guards on the buses and at boarding points to prevent trouble occurring.</p> <p><b>Strategy implemented broadly as planned with some positive outcomes</b></p> <p>The LTP contained a number of targets for improving access. In retrospect, some of these were very subjective and they were dropped part way through the period (see 2004 APR). Of those that were retained, most have been met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over 99% of the City's population now live within 400m of a bus stop or rail station (target 98%);</li> <li>• Over 99% of our signalled pedestrian crossings have facilities to assist disabled people (revised target 100% by 2005);</li> <li>• The number of Dial-a-Ride users had risen to 3,031 (target was for a year-on-year increase) ;</li> <li>• The number of passenger trips on supported bus services had risen to 1,676,000 (target was for a year-on-year increase).</li> </ul> <p>As outlined in the section on Public Transport, we have also installed accessible kerbing at some 500 bus stops and the City's main bus operators now have a combined figure of some 55% of their fleets being low-floor.</p>	<p>Although we achieved most of our targets in this area, there was one instance where this was not the case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25,900 concessionary fares passes were in use;</li> </ul> <p>The target had been to achieve a year-on-year increase in the number of passes in use, but the 2005 figure is some 10.7% lower than the baseline figure of 29,000 passes in use in 1998-1999. In retrospect, there is some uncertainty about the accuracy of the baseline figure as the figures for each of the past four years have been significantly lower than that, and as passes are renewable every two years, and as the number of eligible people has increased over the period, it is felt that there is reasonable doubt. This doubt is increased because the bus operator who, at the time, administered the scheme on behalf of the Council did not, it now appears, keep an accurate record of passholders. Passes are now being issued by the Council on smartcards, so an accurate figure will be available from 2006-2007 onwards.</p>

Delivery Benchmark	What has been done (April 2001 to March 2006)	Explanations for changes to what was planned
<p>5. Record of achievement in relation to provision of facilities (see Section 7.3.2)</p>	<p><b>Strategy implemented as planned with positive outcomes</b></p> <p>Over the course of the LTP, we have implemented a range of facilities to help promote social inclusion. As well as those described in the preceding sections, we have also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued to support two free bus services in the City Centre;</li> <li>• Continued to support the City Centre Shopmobility scheme;</li> <li>• Continued with a programme of introducing tactile paving at uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points;</li> <li>• Continued to provide Disabled Persons' Parking Bays, both in response to individual need and for general use by disabled people;</li> <li>• Extended the CCTV system to cover district centres as well as the City Centre;</li> <li>• Developed the concept of 'clutter zones' in main shopping areas to enable clear pedestrian routes to be created;</li> <li>• Targeted maintenance investment to heavily used footways;</li> <li>• Introduced a real-time bus information system that employs the colour and contrast standards recommended by the RNIB;</li> <li>• Removed nine subways that were threatening (especially to women) and replaced these by at-grade crossing facilities;</li> <li>• Upgraded street lighting in many residential roads;</li> <li>• Continued to support non-commercial bus services, particularly those in the early morning and evenings (to help benefit shift-workers);</li> <li>• Installed over 300 secure cycle parking stands at a wide range of venues (eg GP surgeries, stations, churches, shopping areas, leisure centres, etc);</li> <li>• Undertaken campaigns to remove free-standing advertising boards from the highway.</li> </ul>	<p>Of the proposals relating To Mobility and Social Inclusion set out in the LTP, the great majority have been implemented, with the only significant omission being that we have yet to complete the work on identifying and implementing a network of barrier-free routes to local shopping areas and venues of importance.</p> <p>Some individual routes have been introduced as part of other, more extensive schemes, but we are still developing a prioritised programme of measures (to be undertaken during LTP2).</p>