

National & Local Performance Indicators - All neighbourhoods are safe, clean, green and well maintained

Community Safety		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years			
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	
Council Priority Indicators														
CP-CS50 LPSA2	Reduce overall crime levels in Leeds by 35%	new indicator				-23.9%	-30%	-23.6%	no comparative data			-35%	n/a	n/a
CP-CS3 LAA-SSC19	Increase the percentage of local people who feel they belong to their local area.					71%	increase	64% (1)				Year on year increase (1)	Year on year increase (1)	Year on year increase (1)
CP-CS51a(i) LAA-SSC18a	Increase the percentage of people surveyed that feel safe walking alone in their area during the day.					94%	increase	78% (1)				Year on year increase (1)	Year on year increase (1)	Year on year increase (1)
CP-CS51a(ii) LAA-SSC18b	Increase the percentage of people surveyed that feel safe walking alone in their area after dark.					54%	increase	31% (1)				Year on year increase (1)	Year on year increase (1)	Year on year increase (1)
CP-CS51b LAA-SSC16b	Reduce the percentage of residents who feel that anti-social behaviour has got worse in the past 12 months.					44%	reduce	44%				Year on year increase (1)	Year on year increase (1)	Year on year increase (1)
CP-CS51c	Reduce the percentage of residents who believe that people using or dealing drugs is a very big problem in their area (LCC Annual Residents' Survey)					28%	reduce	See Footnote (2)				See Footnote (2)	See Footnote (2)	See Footnote (2)
CP-CS51d	Reduce the percentage of residents who feel that drunkenness and rowdiness is a very big problem in their area (LCC Annual Residents' Survey)					28%	reduce	See Footnote (2)				See Footnote (2)	See Footnote (2)	See Footnote (2)
Best Value Indicators														
BV-126	Domestic burglaries per 1,000 households	52.1	43.5	29.6	23.9	23.3	25.4	6.4	Bottom	27.5	22.3	21.5	n/a	
BV-127a	Violent offences per 1,000 population	amended indicator			25.1	23.6	23.8	12.5	Bottom	33.5	23.10	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	
BV-127b	Robberies per 1,000 population				1.8	1.8	2.3	0.3	Bottom	3.9	2.10	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	
BV-128	Vehicle crimes per 1,000 population	35.5	29.9	21.3	17.2	16.9	17.3	7.3	Bottom	25.3	16.30	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	
BV-225 (previously BV-176)	Actions against domestic violence	new indicator			90.9%	100.0%	100.0%	no comparative data		61.2%	100.0%	n/a	n/a	
Indicators to be deleted														
BV-198	The number of drug users in treatment per 1,000 head of population aged 15-44	amended indicator			12.7	10.0	11.5	78.3	Bottom	47.3	future targets not required			

Footnotes:

1. These figures are taken from the 2006 Best Value General Survey (Postal), comparisons will be made against the figures recorded for the same questions in the council's 2007 and 2008 annual surveys (Face-to Face). These comparison will be used to gauge progress on related actions and initiatives, and also to inform target setting for the 2009/10 Best Value General Survey.

2. Amended versions of these performance indicators are shown in Appendix * - Local Area Agreement Performance Indicators

Community Safety (continued)		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Local Key Indicators													
LKI-CS6 LAA-SSC29a	Total number of drug users in treatment						3,241	3,765			3,727	4,174	n/a
LKI-CS8a LAA-SSC13	Addressing domestic violence by: Increase the number of reported incidents of domestic violence						12,020	11,180			12,500	13,035	n/a
LKI-CS8b LAA-SSC14	Addressing domestic violence by: Reduce repeat victimisation as a proportion of reported domestic violence incidents						47%	48%			44.8%	43%	n/a
LKI-CS8c LAA-SSC15	Addressing domestic violence by: Increase the number of reported incidents of domestic violence that result in a sanctioned detection						14%	24%			16%	18%	n/a

Housing Management		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Council Priority Indicators													
CP-HM52 BV-63	Energy efficiency - the average SAP rating of local authority owned dwellings	51	53	57	61	64	65	69	Middle	62	67	69	72

Road Maintenance		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Council Priority Indicators													
CP-RM50 BV-223 (Old)	Percentage of the local authority principal road network where structural maintenance should be considered	new indicator			6.0%	n/a	n/a	no comparative data		14.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
CP-RM50 BV-223 (Amended)	Percentage of the local authority principal road network where structural maintenance should be considered	BVPI amended in 2006/07					8.5% (1)			n/a	8.00%	7.00%	6.00%
CP-RM51 BV-224a (Old)	The percentage of the non-principal classified road network where maintenance should be considered	new indicator			13%	n/a	n/a			19.2%	n/a	n/a	n/a
CP-RM51 BV-224a (Amended)	The percentage of the non-principal classified road network where maintenance should be considered	BVPI amended in 2006/07					15.19% (1)			n/a	14.00%	13.00%	12.00%
CP-RM52 BV-224b (Amended)	Percentage of the un-classified road network where structural maintenance should be considered	BVPI amended in 2006/07					26.19% (1)			n/a	21.00%	18.00%	15.00%
CP-RM54 BV-187	Percentage of the footway network where structural maintenance should be considered	30%	33%	36%	30%	30%	19%	12%	Middle	27%	18%	17%	16%
Best Value Indicators													
BV-100	Number of days of temporary traffic controls or road closures on traffic sensitive roads caused by Local Authority roadwork's per km of traffic sensitive road	0.1 days	0.0 days	0.1 days	0 days	0.4 days	2.9 days (3)	0.1 days	Bottom	0.8 days	2.5 days (4)	2.2 days (4)	2.0 days (4)
Local Key Indicators													
LKI-HM2	The percentage of repairs to dangerous damaged roads and pavements which were carried out within 24 hours from the time the Authority first becoming aware of the damage	93.2%	96.5%	93.5%	99.5%	96.5%	99.6%	no comparative data			97% (5)	97.5% (5)	98% (5)
LKI-RM224b (Old BV-224b)	Percentage of the un-classified road network where structural maintenance should be considered	new indicator			23.5%	19.5%	19.0%	no comparative data		16.56%	15.5%	12.0%	12.0%

Footnotes:

1. The funding for 2006/07 was focussed on local roads rather than A & B roads. The method of calculating this indicator changed during 2006/07 and therefore the targets set for 2006/07 and beyond are invalid. Due to these changes the 2005/06 figure is not comparable to the 2006/07 figure. The Council's performance on principal roads places it among the best performing authorities for both Metropolitan Authorities and Core Cities.

2. Last year's BV-224b was reported based on the survey of half the network. This PI reports the true condition of the whole network and is now a baseline for projection of targets. The methodology for calculating this indicator has changed, and now based on a 4 year average. As such, the 2006/07 result isn't comparable to the 2005/06 result. Please note, that had the calculation methodology not changed, we would have exceeded our targets and scored 19%. City Services will continue to track this indicator through a local indicator, LK1 224b.

3. Over the year there has been two major schemes which have contributed to the higher than targeted score. These are Stage 7 of the Leeds Inner Ring Road and the East Leeds Link Road which have contributed 384 days to figures used to calculate the BVPI. The service has also undertaken a major highway and bridge maintenance programme. Overall, closures have been kept to a minimum, conducive to carrying out the works in a cost effective manner. As this work will roll into 2007/08, the targets have been adjusted accordingly.

4. The targets have been revised to reflect 2006/07 performance and the fact that work in relation to Stage 7 of the Inner Ring Road and the East Leeds Link Road will be continued into 2007/08. Other programmed road improvement projects will also be undertaken.

5. Although we exceeded the targets set for 2006/07 we have not changed the targets for future years as we need to allow for factors beyond our control such as the weather which may adversely effect the service delivered.

Refuse Collection & Waste Management		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Council Priority Indicators													
CP-RC50 BV-82a(i)	Total Tonnage of household waste arising - % recycled	10.30%	12.20%	15.79%	17.26%	18.53%	15.83% (1) & (2)	20.87%	Middle	13.75%	18.07% (1) & (2)	19.87% (1) & (2)	21.29% (1) & (2)
CP-RC51 BV-82b(i)	Total Tonnage of household waste arising - % composted	2.40%	2.40%	3.77%	4.07%	4.44%	6.47% (1) & (3)	13.05%	Middle	4.22%	7.39% (1) & (3)	8.13% (1) & (3)	8.71% (1) & (3)
CP-RC52 BV-82d(i)	Total tonnage of household waste arising - % land filled	86.7%	85.4%	80.28%	78.61%	77.00%	77.09% (1)	59.41%	Middle	55.36%	74.52% (1)	71.98% (1)	69.98% (1)
Best Value Indicators													
BV-82a(ii)	Total tonnage of household waste arising which have been sent by the authority for recycling	new indicator			57,389.00	61,676.00	53,486.00 (1) & (2)	15,126.10	Top	32,330.58	61,435.00 (1) & (2)	67,893.00 (1) & (2)	73,108.00 (1) & (2)
BV-82b(ii)	The tonnage of household waste sent by the authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion	new indicator			13,540.00	14,777.00	21,845.00 (1) & (3)	8,770.30	Top	9767.06	25,125.00 (1) & (3)	27,779.00 (1) & (3)	29,910.00 (1) & (3)
BV-82c(i)	Total Tonnage of household waste arising - % used to recover heat, power and other energy sources	0.4%	0%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.53% (1)	6.72%	Middle	24.98%	0.02% (4)	0.02% (4)	0.02% (4)
BV-82c(ii)	Tonnage of household waste arising which have been used to recover heat, power and other energy sources	new indicator			87.00	102.00	1,775.00 (1)	13,174.00	Middle	73,265.76	72.00 (5)	72.00 (5)	72.00 (5)
BV-82d(ii)	Total tonnage of household waste arising which has been land filled	new indicator			261,439.00	256,340.00	260,416.00 (1)	53,892.20	Bottom	121,763.00	253,357.00 (1)	245,945.00 (1)	240,306.00 (1)
BV-84a	Number of Kilograms of household waste collected per head of population	459kg	464kg	473.2kg	462.2kg	462.6kg	467.2kg (1) & (6)	394.0kg	Middle	458.7kg	467.2kg (1)	467.0kg (1)	466.7kg (1)
BV-84b	Percentage change from the previous financial year in the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head of population	new indicator			-2.32%	0.09%	1.1% (1) & (6)	-3.79%	Bottom	-2.99%	0.01% (1)	-0.05% (1)	-0.05% (1)
BV-86	Cost of waste collection per household	£39.55	£54.40	£58.84	£64.48	£62.15	£63.49	£39.48	Bottom	£46.59	£64.23 (7)	£69.64 (7)	£77.01 (7)
BV-87	Cost of waste disposal per tonne for municipal waste	£34.47	£34.99	£28.03	£29.79	£34.03	£31.12	£39.46	Top	£43.43	£38.37 (7)	£44.13 (7)	£48.97 (7)

Footnotes:

- In 2006/07 the waste indicators were calculated for the first time using Waste Data Flow (WDF). The need to use WDF was communicated during the 2006/07 financial year and as such the targets set prior to this are not valid and have therefore been amended accordingly to reflect local performance/projections and the national standards set.
- The 2006/07 year-end figure can be attributed to timber tonnes being down in comparison to the previous year (however, a new timber contract has been let which allows Medium Density Fibreboard to be recycled and as such performance should increase over future years); scrap metal tonnage being down by approximately 900 tonnes and gully waste now being included within the calculation for BV82b and excluded from BV82a. In addition, the SORT rejection rates were calculated last year based on an average whereas this year, a new process within WDF demands that we use the actual rejection rate. Overall performance was offset by the increase in the amount of kerbside recycling (SORT) recovered and an increase in the number of televisions recycled under hazardous waste legislation.
- The increase in tonnage can be attributed to: the introduction of a garden waste collection pilot involving 20,000 households; an increase in the amount of leaf fall collected; and the fact that authorities are now permitted to include gully waste in these figures which hasn't been included previously. In addition, it should be noted that the weather experienced actually had a negative effect on this figure as less garden waste was generated in the first three months of the year.
- Targets have been set at this level as the council is investigating with its contractors, the proportion of SORT rejections that are used to generate heat, power and other energy sources. Targets for future years may need to be revised in light of this work.
- In 2006/07 the council included SORT rejections from one of the contractors as this waste was used to generate heat, power and other energy sources. In 2007/08, these contracts are being re-let and therefore, there is no guarantee this contractor will remain on the council's list. Therefore, the targets have been set at this level to reflect previous performance on this PI (i.e. before 2006/07). The targets for future years (i.e. 08/09 onwards) may need to be amended depending on who wins the contract.
- The reduction in landfill can be attributed to the overall increase in the amount of recycling and composting undertaken by the authority calculated through combining BV82a and b. The performance in this area needs to be considered in relation to the fact that the population of Leeds has also increased by approximately 3,500 households during 2006/07.
- For each of the targets set inflation has been taken into account. If the GDP has to be used we will do so, but the Finance team were not aware of this requirement.

Refuse Collection & Waste Management (continued)		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Best Value Indicators (continued)													
BV-90a	% of people satisfied with waste collection	not required	89%	not required		90%	82% (8)	85% (2006/07 All England Top Quartile)	Middle (after Confidence Interval applied)	77.25% (2006/07 Core Cities Average)	n/a	n/a	see footnote (9)
BV-90b	% of people satisfied with waste recycling	not required	62%			70%	70% (8)	75% (2006/07 All England Top Quartile)	Middle (after Confidence Interval applied)	59% (2006/07 Core Cities Average)	n/a	n/a	see footnote (9)
BV-90c	% of people satisfied with waste disposal	not required	88%			90%	86% (8)	85% (2006/07 All England Top Quartile)	Middle (after Confidence Interval applied)	79% (2006/07 Core Cities Average)	n/a	n/a	see footnote (9)
BV-91a	Percentage of population resident in the Authority's area served by a kerbside collection of recyclables	43.5%	76.2%	88.1%	90.1%	95.0%	92.4%	100.0%	Bottom	90.2%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
BV-91b	Percentage of population resident in the Authority's area served by a kerbside collection of at least two recyclables	new indicator			90.1%	95.0%	92.4%	100.0%	Bottom	64.3%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
BV-218a	Percentage of new reports of abandoned vehicles investigated within 24 hours of notification				89.24%	90.00%	92.54% (10)	96.64%	Middle	75.93%	92.50%	92.50% (11)	92.50%
BV-218b	Percentage of abandoned vehicles removed within 24 hours from the point at which the Authority is legally entitled to remove the vehicle				83.33%	85.00%	92.17% (10)	95.00%	Middle	74.20%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Local Key Indicators													
LKI - RC1	Number of household waste collections missed per 100,000 collections	87	127	679	151	100	84.6 (12)	no comparative data			95 (13)	90 (13)	85 (13)
LKI-RC1b	Percentage of household waste collections made on schedule	new indicator		99.3%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9% (14)				99.9%	99.9%	99.9%

Footnotes:

8. Satisfaction surveys in 2003/04 and 2006/07 are not directly comparable as in 2003/04 face to face surveys were performed whilst in 2006/07 postal surveys were used (as per government guidelines).

9. Targets for Best Value General Survey indicators will be confirmed the year prior to the next survey (to be undertaken in 2009/10) in order to take into account any factors affecting performance which may influence customer satisfaction.

10. The target set for 2006/07 being exceeded can be attributed to LCC working in partnership with West Yorkshire Police through the appointment of a police officer whose role is solely to investigate and deal with abandoned vehicles. This partnership allows more timely access to information and increased responsiveness to the public. Increased DVLA powers have also assisted in performance.

11. The target for 2008/09 has been amended because the current partnership between LCC and West Yorkshire Police on abandoned vehicles is due to be reviewed from this date.

12. Targets for 2006/07 have been exceeded through the re-mapping of some routes specifically to minimise the number of missed bins. In addition, the service has worked with Finance to perform a staff audit which aimed to gain the maximum benefit from the crews and involved greater management of those bins reported as missed bins, by the crews. In conjunction with this notices were issued to utility companies causing disruption to the service through road closures due to their maintenance work. However, please be aware the figure achieved in 2005/06 isn't comparable to 2006/07 due to the fact that this figure is influenced by the weigh bridge rules that were introduced in the first ten weeks of 2005/06.

13. Targets have been set to allow for the 20,000 households on the pilot garden waste scheme which will continue running until October 2007. This factor was not included in last year's predicted target.

14. The figure achieved in 2005/06 isn't comparable to 2006/07 due to the fact that this figure is influenced by the weigh bridge rules that were introduced in the first ten weeks of 2005/06.

Street Cleansing		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Council Priority Indicators													
CP-SC50 BV-199a	The proportion of relevant land and highways assessed as having combined deposits of litter and detritus across four categories of cleanliness (Clean, Light, Significant, Heavy)	37.0%	31.2%	27.1%	19.9%	19.0%	17.3% (1)	8.8%	Middle	18.1%	16.0%	15.0%	15.0%
Best Value Indicators													
BV-89	The percentage of people satisfied with cleanliness standards	not required	73%	not required	n/a	63%		73% (2006/07 All England Top Quartile)	Middle (after Confidence Interval applied)	60% (2006/07 Core Cities Average)	n/a	n/a	63%
BV-199b	The proportion of relevant land and highways (as a percentage) from which unacceptable levels of graffiti are visible	new indicator			11%	10%	6% (2)	1%	Bottom	11%	7% (3)	6% (3)	5% (3)
BV-199c	The proportion of relevant land and highways (as a percentage) from which unacceptable levels of fly posting are visible	new indicator			1%	1%	1%	0%	Middle	3%	1%	1%	1%
BV-199d	The year on year reduction in the total number of incidents and increase in total number of enforcement actions taken to deal with fly tipping	new indicator			n/a	n/a	3	no comparative data			2 (4)	3 (4)	3 (4)
Local Key Indicators													
LKI-SC6	The average time taken to remove fly tips	2.5 days	1.7 days	0.8 days	1.4 days	1.3 days	1.1 days	no comparative data			1.15 days	1 day	1 day

Footnotes:

1. This improvement in performance has been realised through the work undertaken by environmental pride teams in Super Output Areas (SOAs) thus improving the scores picked up as part of the city wide surveys. During the year, this work was also supported by a chewing gum campaign run in conjunction with DEFRA, a cigarette butts campaign run in conjunction with ENCAMS and an increase in the enforcement actions and value of fines issued by the Enforcement Team. Overall, the work undertaken contributed to the achievement of a place in the finals of the 'Clean Britain Awards'. Targets have been revised to reflect these improvements, and to continue to meet agreed standards.
2. This target being exceeded can be attributed to the extra intensive neighbourhood management funding provided to enable an extra team to work in 'hot spot' areas within the North West wedge, resulting in a significant increase in the number of graffiti incidents removed compared to the previous year. In addition, the increased value of the fines issued under the Neighbourhoods & Environment Act may also have acted as a deterrent. Overall, the work undertaken has contributed to the achievement of a place in the finals of the 'Clean Britain Awards'.
3. The targets set for 2007/08 onwards have been amended from the last Council plan to reflect the improved performance noted on this indicator in 2006/07. The targets set a stretching level of performance but reflect the council's commitment to clean and green neighbourhoods and the increased resources targeted at hot spot areas.
4. The targets reflect the fact that in 2007/08, the enforcement section has additional staff resources to combat fly tipping through neighbourhood renewal funding (NRF). Targets for future years (2008/09 and 2009/10) have been set on the premise that the NRF funding will not be available and as a result the level of staff resource available to undertake enforcement action against fly tippers will be reduced. As this PI requires an increase in enforcement action and a reduction in the incidence of fly tipping, it is envisaged that in 2009/10 the authority's performance may be ranked as 'poor' due to its successes in previous years (where we had additional staff resources).
5. Targets for Best Value General Survey indicators will be confirmed the year prior to the next survey (to be undertaken in 2009/10) in order to take into account any factors affecting performance which may influence customer satisfaction.

Street Lighting		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Best Value Indicators													
BV-215a	The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault which is under the control of the local authority	new indicator			8.52 days	6.5 days		3.43 days	Bottom	5.64 days	5 days	5 days	
BV-215b	The average time taken to repair a street lighting fault, where response time is under the control of a DNO	new indicator			7.17 days	8.3 days		14.03 days	Top	28.46 days	7.8 days	7.2 days	
Local Key Indicators													
LKI-SL2	Percentage of street lamps not working as planned	1.9%	1.75%	1.90%	2%	2%		no comparative data			1.5%	1.25%	

Road Safety		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Council Priority Indicators													
CP-TM52 BV-99	a (i) Number of people Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) in road traffic collisions	439.0	518.0	443.0	435.0	387.0	352.0	83.0	Bottom	291.8	376.0	365.0	354.0
	a (ii) % change in the number of people KSI in road traffic collisions since the previous year	new indicator	18.0%	-14.5%	-1.8%	-11.0%	-19.1%	-19.3%	Middle	-1.9%	-2.80%	-2.90%	-3.00%
	a (iii) % change in number of people KSI in road traffic collisions since the 1994-98 average		-6.3%	-20.0%	-21.5%	-30.1%	-36.5%	-40.4%	Middle	-13.5%	-32.1%	-34.1%	-36.2%
	c (i) Number of people slightly injured in road traffic collisions	new indicator	4009.0		3691.0	3809.0	3440.0	718.0	Bottom	2598.4	3708.0	3608.0	3500.0
	c (ii) % change in number of people slightly injured in road traffic collisions since the previous year		-0.4%	-7.9%	3.2%	-6.8%	-8.6%	Middle	-3.9%	-2.7%	-2.7%	-2.8%	
	c (iii) % change in number of people slightly injured in road traffic collisions since the 1994-1998 average		-3.8%	-11.5%	-8.6%	-17.5%	-21.1%	Middle	-3.3%	-11.1%	-13.5%	-15.0%	

Environment		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Council Priority Indicators													
CP-EN50 BV-216a	Number of "sites of potential concern" with respect to land contamination	new indicator			682	2,466	1,687	no comparative data		2,593	4,191	4,341	4,491
CP-EN52	Reduce energy consumption in Council buildings by at least 10%				464,682 mwh	6% reduction (total of 449,320 mwh)	To be provided in the Council Plan Addendum	No comparative data		To be confirmed	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	
Best Value Indicators													
BV-216b	Number of sites for which sufficient detailed information is available to decide whether remediation of the land is necessary, as a percentage of all "sites of potential concern"	new indicator			13%	6%	6%	9%	Middle	14%	4%	4%	4%

Sustainable Development		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Best Value Indicators													
BV-219b	% of conservation areas in the local authority area with an up to date character appraisal	new indicator			4.80%	9.00%	7.81%	31.81%	Middle	29.08%	15.40%	23.10%	30.80%
Indicators to be deleted													
BV-219a	Total number of conservation areas in the local authority area	new indicator			63	65	64	no comparative data		33	future targets not required		
BV-219c	% of conservation areas with published management proposals				0%	0%	n/a	7.7	Middle	3.09%			

Parks & Countryside		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
Council Priority Indicators													
CP-PC50 LAA-SSC5 LKI-GF1	The % of P&C sites assessed that meet the Green Flag standard	new indicator		11%	13%	14%	16%	no comparative data			17%	19%	21%
CP-PC51	The % of residents satisfied with parks and open spaces (Collected from Annual Residents Survey)	new indicator			64%	increase	n/a (1)				Year on year increase	Year on year increase	n/a (1)
Best Value Indicators													
BV-119e	The % of residents satisfied with parks and open spaces	not required	74%	not required		n/a	79% (2)	78% (2006/07 All England Top Quartile)	Middle (after Confidence Interval applied)	73% (2006/07 Core Cities Average)	n/a	n/a	n/a (3)
BV-178	The percentage of total length of footpaths and other rights of way which were easy to use by members of the public.	58.4%	68.0%	70.2%	74.7%	78.0%	58.2% (4)	88.2%	Bottom	76.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a

Footnotes:

- The LCC Annual Residents' Survey is not carried out in the same year as the Best Value General Survey is undertaken, therefore as the BV survey was carried out this year, there is no result available for this indicator and a target is not applicable for 2009/10 which is the next year the BV survey will be undertaken
- Continued investment in the parks and countryside service through the Parks Urban Renaissance Programme (£500k community parks, £2.5m Parks Urban Renaissance 2006/7 – 2007/8, £175k PROW, £175k Allotments, £470k PAYP, and £750k Parks Urban Renaissance 2008/9 – 2010/11) has now begun to enable improvement in the quality of parks and the facilities offered, which in turn has led to an improvement in visitor satisfaction with parks and open spaces in Leeds and a corresponding increase in visits. Satisfaction surveys in 2003/04 and 2006/07 are not directly comparable as in 2003/04 face to face surveys were performed whilst in 2006/07 postal surveys were used (as per government guidelines).
- Targets for Best Value General Survey indicators will be confirmed the year prior to the next survey (to be undertaken in 2009/10) in order to take into account any factors affecting performance which may influence customer satisfaction.
- This PI is based on a site survey of 5% of total footpath and right of way provision, with a key element relating to whether the length of path way has an adequate number of sign posts. Despite good assessments of bridges, surface conditions and stiles and gates, the number of sign posts led to a lower score on the indicator. Despite the inherent problems with the 5% sample, the service will continue to seek to achieve the top quartile within the Metropolitan Authorities benchmarking group, currently 81.1%.