



**NHT Survey Report** 

2020 Authority Annual Report

**NHT NETWORK PARTNERS** 

www.nhtnetwork.org







**Executive Summary** 



#### Introduction

The National Highway and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey (NHT Survey) collects the public's views on different aspects of Highway and Transport in local authority areas, it covers; Pavements, Cycle Routes/Lanes, Local Bus Services, Local Taxi (or mini cab) Services, Community Transport, Demand Responsive Transport, Safety on Roads, Traffic Congestion, Levels of Traffic Pollution, Street Lighting, the Condition of Roads and the local Rights of Way Network. It asks detailed questions about each aspect in turn and this year there are new questions canvassing opinion on climate change, changing travel habits and congestion charging.

Responses to the survey are compiled into Key Benchmark Indicators (KBIs) and Benchmark Indicators (BIs) for each Authority for comparison purposes, most of which measure satisfaction. There are also a range of Key Quality Indicators (KQIs) and Quality Indicators (QIs) which cover the non-satisfaction related questions in the survey, measuring ease of access to services, levels of provision and how well informed the public feel.

### Importance, Satisfaction and Spending Priorities

The Survey asks the public to rate how important they regard key aspects of highways and transport and how satisfied they are with each one. The Bradford public placed most importance on 'The condition of roads' and 'Safety on roads' and least importance on 'Cycle routes and lanes' and 'Demand responsive transport'. In terms of satisfaction with the same key aspects they were most satisfied with 'Local taxi (or minicab) services' and least satisfied with 'Traffic congestion'.

Looking at the difference between the levels of importance and the corresponding levels of satisfaction, the biggest differential between the two was for 'The condition of roads' and the closest alignment was for 'Local bus services'.

The survey also asks where the public feel that the level of service provided could be reduced by spending less and where the level of service should be improved by spending more. 'Local taxi (or mini-cab) services' was the most popular choice for a possible reduction in the level of service by spending less, while 'The condition of roads' was the most popular choice for improving the level of service and spending more.

#### **Public Satisfaction Indicators**

Bradford's satisfaction scores in this years survey range from a high of 80% for 'Availability of taxis or minicabs (PTBI21)', to a low of 34% for 'Tackling illegal onstreet parking (TCBI11)', with the majority of results over 50%.

Taking this year's results and comparing them with last year, 24 indicators improved on last year or remained the same and 42 reduced.

The biggest single improvement in result was for 'Communication (aspects) (KQI02)' which improved by 6% while the indicator with largest recorded reduction in satisfaction was 'Keeping drains clear and working (HMBI12)' which reduced by -9%.

Comparing Bradford's results with all other authorities taking part this year, 75 indicators are on or above average and 61 indicators are below average.

The largest positive difference from the NHT Average was for 'Availability of taxis or minicabs (PTBI21)' which was 9% above average, while the indicator with largest negative difference in satisfaction from average was 'Undertakes cold weather gritting (salting) (HMBI28)' which was -11% below average with an actual score of 47%.

**Executive Summary** 



#### Ease of Access, Provision and Well Informed Indicators

Bradford's ease of access results range from a high of 82% for 'Ease of access to local shops/supermarkets (ABI03)' to a low of 66% for 'Ease of access to hospital (ABI04)'.

The public felt most well informed about 'Climate Change (QI18)' with a score of 56% and least well informed about 'Local air quality (QI07)' with a score of 30%.

The provision indicators produced no conclusive results this year with the most popular choice for each question being about the right amount.

In relation to the questions about potholes and repairs to local roads, the public felt there were 'More' potholes and damaged holes than a year ago and that the Council were doing 'About the Same' to repair local roads than a year ago.

### Changing Travel Habits and Congestion Charging

There were new questions in the Survey this year canvassing opinion about changing travel habits and congestion charging.

The public 'Tended to disagree' with the statement that they could travel less by car than they currently do and 'Tended to agree' that they could walk, cycle or use public transport more than they currently do.

The most popular answer to the question about congestion charging was to 'Strongly oppose' such a scheme being introduced.

### Sample Size and Response Rates

Bradford has taken part in the NHT Survey six times and is one of the 109 authorities across the UK to take part in the survey this year. The survey was sent to 4,000 households across the authority area and 805 members of the public responded, including 102 on-line. This represents an overall response rate of 20.1% compared with the national average of 23.8%.

#### Notes

Changes to Survey questions and the effect on trend reporting

A number of changes are made to questionnaire each year, some new questions are introduced, some existing questions are dropped. This year some individual questions have been split and two new questions to improve the clarity of the public views. Trend results are not provided for these new questions.

The introduction of new questions affects the composition and calculation of some of the Survey's 26 Key Benchmark Indicators (KBI's) and where this is the case trend results are not provided, although all historic KPI scores are retained. There is a corresponding knock effect on the calculation of Theme Scores and where this is the case the trend scores for the Survey Themes are not provided.

Trend scores will be reintroduced wherever possible in next year's results

Satisfaction Results



## Highest and Lowest Scores

## 10 Highest Scores

Reference	Type	Indicator	Theme	Score
PTBI21	BI	Availability of taxis or minicabs	Public Transport	80%
PTBI22	BI	Reliability of taxis or minicabs	Public Transport	77%
KBI09	KBI	Taxi/mini cab services	Public Transport	73%
PTBI05	BI	How easy buses are to get on/off	Public Transport	73%
PTBI02	BI	Number of bus stops	Public Transport	71%
PTBI09	BI	Helpfulness of drivers	Public Transport	69%
CMQI02	QI	Professionalism of staff re enquiries	Communications	68%
CMQI01	QI	Ease of contact for enquiries	Communications	66%
KBI06	KBI	Local bus services (overall)	Public Transport	66%
PTBI10	BI	Personal safety on the bus	Public Transport	65%

#### 10 Lowest Scores

Reference	Type	Indicator	Theme	Score
TCBI11	BI	Tackling illegal onstreet parking	Tackling Congestion	34%
HMBI30	BI	Speed of repair to damaged roads	Highway Maintenance	35%
WCBI07	BI	Pavements clear of obstruction	Walking/Cycling	37%
KBI19	KBI	Traffic management	Tackling Congestion	38%
TCBI13	BI	Good park and ride schemes	Tackling Congestion	38%
TCBI14	BI	The routes taken by HGV's	Tackling Congestion	39%
TCBI12	BI	Restrictions of parking on busy roads	Tackling Congestion	40%
HMBI19	BI	Cuts back overgrown hedges	Highway Maintenance	40%
KBI23	KBI	Condition of highways	Highway Maintenance	40%
HMBI18	BI	Provides information on Gritting	Highway Maintenance	40%

Satisfaction Results



# Highest Ranked and Lowest Ranked

## 10 Highest Ranked Scores

Name	Туре	Indicator	Theme	Score	Rank
KBI09	KBI	Taxi/mini cab services	Public Transport	73%	2
PTBI21	ВІ	Availability of taxis or minicabs	Public Transport	80%	3
PTBI22	ВІ	Reliability of taxis or minicabs	Public Transport	77%	5
PTBI23	ВІ	Cost (fares) of taxis or minicabs	Public Transport	63%	6
WCBI11	BI	Cycle crossing facilities at junctions	Walking/Cycling	53%	8
WCBI29	BI	The location of the cycle lanes provided	Walking/Cycling	52%	9
WCBI12	BI	Cycle parking	Walking/Cycling	49%	9
WCBI19	BI	Signposting of rights of way	Walking/Cycling	60%	10
KQI03	KQI	Responsive transport	Public Transport	59%	10
PTBI18	ВІ	Info to help people plan journeys	Public Transport	63%	11

#### 10 Lowest Ranked Scores

Name	Type	Indicator	Theme	Score	Rank
KBI20	KBI	Road safety locally	Road Safety	49%	108
RSBI02	BI	Speed controls (e.g. road humps)	Road Safety	47%	108
HMBI28	BI	Undertakes cold weather gritting (salting)	Highway Maintenance	47%	108
HMBI29	BI	Undertakes snow clearance	Highway Maintenance	44%	108
HMBI06	BI	Speed of repair to street lights	Highway Maintenance	52%	105
RSBI03	BI	Location of speed control measures	Road Safety	49%	104
RSBI01	BI	Speed limits	Road Safety	58%	103
RSBI06	BI	Safety of children walking to school	Road Safety	50%	103
HMBI02	BI	Cleanliness of roads	Highway Maintenance	48%	103
RSBI04	BI	Safety of walking	Road Safety	56%	102

Trend Results



## **Summary of Changes**

The table below summarises the change in Bradford's results compared with last year by size of the change and type of indicator.

Change Result	Key Benchmark Indicators	Benchmark Indicators	Key Quaity Indicators	Quality Indicators
4%+ above last year	0	0	1	2
0-3% above last year	15	8	2	5
0-3% below last year	2	15	1	1
4%+ below last year	2	23	0	1

## Biggest Indivdual Changes

Indicators 4% or more up on last year

The table below lists any indicators where Bradford's score has improved by 4% or more compared with last year's Survey result.

Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Trend	Result
Key Qua	lity Indicator				
KQI02	Communication (aspects)	Satisfaction	Communications	6%	48%
Quality I	ndicator				
CMQI01	Ease of contact for enquiries	Satisfaction	Communications	4%	66%
CMQI02	Professionalism of staff re enquiries	Satisfaction	Communications	4%	68%

#### Indicators 4% or more down on last year

The table below lists any indicators where Bradford's score has reduced 4% or more compared with last year's Survey result.

Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Trend	Result
Generate	d at 21/10/2020 16:11			http://www.nhtn	etwork.org

# 2020 Authority Annual Report Trend Results





Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Trend	Result
Key Benc	hmark Indicator				
KBI22	Road safety education	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-6%	48%
KBI12	Pavements & footpaths (aspects)	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-4%	52%
Benchma	ark Indicator				
HMBI09	Maintenance of verges/trees/shrub	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-9%	46%
HMBI12	Keeping drains clear and working	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-9%	41%
RSBI09	Road safety education motorcycles	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-8%	48%
WCBI01	The provision of pavements	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-7%	61%
TCBI01	Advanced warning of roadworks	Satisfaction	Tackling Congestion	-7%	57%
WCBI03	The cleanliness of pavements	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-7%	42%
WCBI02	The condition of pavements	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-7%	51%
WCBI14	Cycle route information e.g. maps	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-6%	48%
HMBI02	Cleanliness of roads	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-6%	48%
HMBI19	Cuts back overgrown hedges	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-6%	40%
RSBI08	Road safety training/education children	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-6%	51%
RSBI02	Speed controls (e.g. road humps)	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-6%	47%
RSBI03	Location of speed control measures	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-5%	49%
HMBI11	Provision of Drains	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-5%	48%
HMBI05	Provision of street Lighting	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-5%	59%
HMBI06	Speed of repair to street lights	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-4%	52%
WCBI05	Provision of safe crossing points	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-4%	56%
TCBI03	Time taken to complete roadworks	Satisfaction	Tackling Congestion	-4%	43%
RSBI01	Speed limits	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-4%	58%
RSBI10	Road safety education young drivers	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-4%	45%
WCBI13	Direction signing for cycle routes	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-4%	52%
HMBI20	Deals with mud on the road	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-4%	46%

# 2020 Authority Annual Report Trend Results



Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Trend	Result	
HMBI22	Deals with flooding on roads	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-4%	45%	
Quality Indicator						
CMQI04	Informed about public transport	Well Informed	Communications	-5%	50%	

http://www.nhtnetwork.org Generated at 21/10/2020 16:11

Benchmarking Results



## Summary of Differences

The table below summarises the difference between Bradford's results and the NHT average by size of the difference and type of indicator.

Change Result	Key Benchmark Indicators	Benchmark Indicators	Key Quality Indicators	Quality Indicators
4%+ above average	4	20	1	2
0-3% above average	12	34	3	14
0-3% below average	7	31	1	3
4%+ below average	4	16	0	4

## Biggest Indivdual Differences

Indicators 4%+ above NHT Average

The table below lists any indicators where Bradford's score is 4% or more above the NHT Average score in this year's Survey.

Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Gap	Result
Key Ben	chmark Indicator				
KBI09	Taxi/mini cab services	Satisfaction	Public Transport	7%	73%
KBI06	Local bus services (overall)	Satisfaction	Public Transport	6%	66%
KBI14	Cycle routes and facilities (aspects)	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	5%	51%
KBI23	Condition of highways	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	4%	40%
Key Qua	lity Indicator				
KQ103	Responsive transport	Satisfaction	Public Transport	4%	59%
Benchm	ark Indicator				
PTBI23	Cost (fares) of taxis or minicabs	Satisfaction	Public Transport	9%	63%
PTBI21	Availability of taxis or minicabs	Satisfaction	Public Transport	9%	80%
Generated	at 21/10/2020 16:11			http://www.nhtr	network.org

Benchmarking Results



Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Gap	Result
PTBI22	Reliability of taxis or minicabs	Satisfaction	Public Transport	7%	77%
WCBI27	The number of cycle lanes provided	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	6%	50%
WCBI28	The number of cycle routes provided	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	6%	51%
WCBI29	The location of the cycle lanes provided	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	6%	52%
HMBI13	Deals with potholes/damaged roads	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	6%	41%
WCBI11	Cycle crossing facilities at junctions	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	5%	53%
PTBI13	The amount of information	Satisfaction	Public Transport	5%	61%
HMBI01	Condition of road surfaces	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	5%	42%
PTBI19	Reliability of electronic display info	Satisfaction	Public Transport	5%	57%
WCBI14	Cycle route information e.g. maps	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	5%	48%
WCBI12	Cycle parking	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	5%	49%
HMBI31	Quality of repair to damaged roads	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	5%	43%
HMBI30	Speed of repair to damaged roads	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	4%	35%
WCBI13	Direction signing for cycle routes	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	4%	52%
WCBI21	Ease of use by those with disabilities	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	4%	49%
PTBI18	Info to help people plan journeys	Satisfaction	Public Transport	4%	63%
WCBI10	Condition of cycle routes	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	4%	56%
WCBI19	Signposting of rights of way	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	4%	60%
Quality Ir	ndicator				
HMQI11	Number of potholes	More or Less	Highway Maintenance	5%	33%
TCQI23	Travel less by car	Agreeement	Tackling Congestion	4%	44%

## Indicators 4%+ below NHT Average

The table below lists any indicators where Bradford's score is 4% or more below the NHT Average score in this year's Survey.

Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Gap	Result

# 2020 Authority Annual Report Benchmarking Results



Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Gap	Result
Key Benc	hmark Indicator				
KBI20	Road safety locally	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-8%	49%
KBI17	Traffic levels & congestion	Satisfaction	Tackling Congestion	-5%	41%
KBI19	Traffic management	Satisfaction	Tackling Congestion	-4%	38%
KBI21	Road safety environment	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-4%	50%
Benchma	ark Indicator				
HMBI28	Undertakes cold weather gritting (salting)	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-11%	47%
HMBI29	Undertakes snow clearance	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-9%	44%
TCBI13	Good park and ride schemes	Satisfaction	Tackling Congestion	-7%	38%
WCBI03	The cleanliness of pavements	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-6%	42%
RSBI02	Speed controls (e.g. road humps)	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-6%	47%
HMBI02	Cleanliness of roads	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-6%	48%
HMBI06	Speed of repair to street lights	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-6%	52%
ABI07	Ease of access to leisure facilities	Ease of Access	Accessibility	-5%	71%
RSBI04	Safety of walking	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-5%	56%
HMBI12	Keeping drains clear and working	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-5%	41%
RSBI01	Speed limits	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-5%	58%
RSBI03	Location of speed control measures	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-5%	49%
WCBI05	Provision of safe crossing points	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-4%	56%
WCBI07	Pavements clear of obstruction	Satisfaction	Walking/Cycling	-4%	37%
RSBI06	Safety of children walking to school	Satisfaction	Road Safety	-4%	50%
HMBI18	Provides information on Gritting	Satisfaction	Highway Maintenance	-4%	40%
Quality Ir	ndicator				
RSQI09	Provision of speed controls	Provision	Road Safety	-10%	54%
CMQI21	Informed about personal actions on climate change	Well Informed	Communications	-6%	49%
CMQI18	Informed about climate change	Well Informed	Communications	-4%	56%

Generated at 21/10/2020 16:11

# 2020 Authority Annual Report Benchmarking Results



Ref	Indicator	Indicator Type	Theme	Gap	Result
CMQI03	Speed & quality of response to enquiries	Satisfaction	Communications	-4%	51%

Results by Theme



## Accessibility

Number of Indicators Up or Down since last year

Type	Up 4%+	Up 0 to 3%	Down 0 to 3%	Down 4%+
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	3	0	0
Benchmark Indicator	0	7	1	0

Number of Indicators Above or Below Average

Type	4%+ Above	Up to 3% Above	Up to 3% Below	4%+ Below
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	1	2	0
Benchmark Indicator	0	3	4	1

#### **Indicator Results**

Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
Key Be	nchmark Indicator						
KBI03	Ease of access (all)	75%	1%	77%	-2%	4	86
KBI04	Ease of access (disabilities)	67%	0%	66%	1%	2	43
KBI05	Ease of access (no car)	69%	0%	70%	-1%	3	59
Bench	mark Indicator						
ABI01	Ease of access to where you work (if you do)	74%	2%	75%	-1%	3	64
ABI02	Ease of sccess to post office/banks	76%	2%	76%	0%	2	48
ABI03	Ease of access to local shops/supermarkets	82%	2%	82%	0%	2	51
ABI04	Ease of access to hospital	66%	3%	68%	-2%	3	77
ABI05	Ease of access to doctors and health facilities	81%	3%	79%	2%	1	20
ABI06	Ease of access to school/college	77%	-2%	79%	-2%	4	90
ABI07	Ease of access to leisure facilities	71%	0%	76%	-5%	4	107
ABI08	Ease of access to visit friends/family	74%	1%	76%	-2%	4	90

Results by Theme



## Communications

Number of Indicators Up or Down since last year

Type	Up 4%+	Up 0 to 3%	Down 0 to 3%	Down 4%+
Key Quality Indicator	1	0	1	0
Quality Indicator	2	3	1	1

Number of Indicators Above or Below Average

Туре	4%+ Above	Up to 3% Above	Up to 3% Below	4%+ Below
Key Quality Indicator	0	2	0	0
Quality Indicator	0	7	2	3

#### **Indicator Results**

Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
Key Qua	lity Indicator						
KQI01	Enquiry handling overall	51%	-1%	51%	0%	2	53
KQI02	Communication (aspects)	48%	6%	48%	0%	2	45
Quality	ndicator						
CMQI01	Ease of contact for enquiries	66%	4%	66%	0%	3	54
CMQI02	Professionalism of staff re enquiries	68%	4%	69%	-1%	2	63
CMQI03	Speed & quality of response to enquiries	51%	0%	55%	-4%	4	88
CMQI04	Informed about public transport	50%	-5%	48%	2%	2	30
CMQI05	Informed about highways and transport	46%	-1%	45%	1%	2	41
CMQI06	Informed about action to repair local roads	35%	0%	33%	2%	1	26
CMQI07	Informed about local air quality	30%	1%	27%	3%	1	15
CMQI14	Informed about council transport and highways services	42%		40%	2%	2	16
CMQI17	Reporting back what had been done	42%		44%	-2%	4	68
CMQI18	Informed about climate change	56%		60%	-4%	1	93
CMQI20	Informed about council actions on climate change	31%		29%	2%	4	12
CMQI21	Informed about personal actions on climate change	49%		55%	-6%	2	103

Results by Theme



## HIghway Maintenance

Number of Indicators Up or Down since last year

Type	Up 4%+	Up 0 to 3%	Down 0 to 3%	Down 4%+
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	2	0	0
Benchmark Indicator	0	1	3	9
Quality Indicator	0	2	0	0

Number of Indicators Above or Below Average

Туре	4%+ Above	Up to 3% Above	Up to 3% Below	4%+ Below
Key Benchmark Indicator	1	0	3	0
Benchmark Indicator	4	4	9	6
Quality Indicator	1	1	1	0

#### Indicator Results

Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
Key Benc	hmark Indicator						
KBI23	Condition of highways	40%	0%	36%	4%	1	22
KBI24	Highway maintenance	48%		50%	-2%	3	73
KBI25	Street lighting	63%	0%	64%	-1%	3	67
KBI26	Highway enforcement/obstructions	44%		45%	-1%	3	60
Benchma	rk Indicator						
HMBI01	Condition of road surfaces	42%	-3%	37%	5%	1	21
HMBI02	Cleanliness of roads	48%	-6%	54%	-6%	4	103
HMBI03	Condition of road markings	56%	-2%	54%	2%	2	40
HMBI05	Provision of street Lighting	59%	-5%	62%	-3%	4	90
HMBI06	Speed of repair to street lights	52%	-4%	58%	-6%	4	105
HMBI09	Maintenance of verges/trees/shrub	46%	-9%	47%	-1%	3	72
HMBI11	Provision of Drains	48%	-5%	50%	-2%	3	82
HMBI12	Keeping drains clear and working	41%	-9%	46%	-5%	4	94
HMBI13	Deals with potholes/damaged roads	41%	1%	35%	6%	1	15
HMBI18	Provides information on Gritting	40%	-2%	44%	-4%	4	97
HMBI19	Cuts back overgrown hedges	40%	-6%	42%	-2%	4	83

# 2020 Authority Annual Report Results by Theme





Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
HMBI20	Deals with mud on the road	46%	-4%	48%	-2%	4	82
HMBI22	Deals with flooding on roads	45%	-4%	44%	1%	2	35
HMBI23	Speed of repair to damaged pavements	41%		39%	2%	2	46
HMBI24	Quality of repair to damaged pavements	49%		47%	2%	2	36
HMBI25	Weed killing on pavements	42%		45%	-3%	4	87
HMBI26	Condition of road signs	59%		61%	-2%	3	73
HMBI27	Cleanliness of road signs	56%		58%	-2%	3	72
HMBI28	Undertakes cold weather gritting (salting)	47%		58%	-11%	4	108
HMBI29	Undertakes snow clearance	44%		53%	-9%	4	108
HMBI30	Speed of repair to damaged roads	35%		31%	4%	1	22
HMBI31	Quality of repair to damaged roads	43%		38%	5%	1	19
HMBI32	Weed killing on and roads	49%		50%	-1%	3	75
Quality Ir	ndicator						
HMQI11	Number of potholes	33%	1%	28%	5%	1	20
HMQI12	Action to repair local roads	39%	0%	38%	1%	2	46
HMQI13	Provision of street-lights	76%		79%	-3%	4	88

Results by Theme



## **Public Transport**

Number of Indicators Up or Down since last year

Type	Up 4%+	Up 0 to 3%	Down 0 to 3%	Down 4%+
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	3	0	0
Key Quality Indicator	0	1	0	0
Benchmark Indicator	0	0	0	0
Quality Indicator	0	0	0	0

Number of Indicators Above or Below Average

Туре	4%+ Above	Up to 3% Above	Up to 3% Below	4%+ Below
Key Benchmark Indicator	2	3	0	0
Key Quality Indicator	1	1	0	0
Benchmark Indicator	6	15	5	0
Quality Indicator	0	1	0	0

#### **Indicator Results**

Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
Key Ber	nchmark Indicator						
KBI06	Local bus services (overall)	66%	2%	60%	6%	1	17
KBI07	Local bus services (aspects)	59%		57%	2%	2	46
KBI08	Public transport information	46%		44%	2%	2	45
KBI09	Taxi/mini cab services	73%	0%	66%	7%	1	2
KBI10	Community transport	61%	1%	58%	3%	1	11
Key Qua	ality Indicator						
KQI03	Responsive transport	59%	1%	55%	4%	1	10
KQI05	Ppublic transport information (aspects)	59%		56%	3%	1	17
Benchm	nark Indicator						
PTBI01	Frequency of bus services	63%		60%	3%	2	37
PTBI02	Number of bus stops	71%		70%	1%	2	43
PTBI03	The state of bus stops	61%		60%	1%	2	51
PTBI04	Whether buses arrive on time	58%		56%	2%	2	41
PTBI05	How easy buses are to get on/off	73%		73%	0%	3	54
PTBI06	The local bus service overall	63%		61%	2%	2	43

# 2020 Authority Annual Report Results by Theme





Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
PTBI07	Bus fares	47%		50%	-3%	4	85
PTBI08	Quality and cleanliness of buses	62%		63%	-1%	3	69
PTBI09	Helpfulness of drivers	69%		68%	1%	2	44
PTBI10	Personal safety on the bus	65%		68%	-3%	4	87
PTBI11	Personal safety at bus stops	61%		63%	-2%	3	78
PTBI12	Raised kerbs at bus stops	63%		66%	-3%	4	86
PTBI13	The amount of information	61%		56%	5%	1	12
PTBI14	The clarity of information	60%		58%	2%	2	26
PTBI15	The accuracy of information	61%		58%	3%	1	17
PTBI16	Ease of finding the right information	58%		55%	3%	1	16
PTBI17	Information about accessible buses	55%		53%	2%	2	34
PTBI18	Info to help people plan journeys	63%		59%	4%	1	11
PTBI19	Reliability of electronic display info	57%		52%	5%	1	24
PTBI20	Provision of public transport info	59%		56%	3%	1	27
PTBI21	Availability of taxis or minicabs	80%		71%	9%	1	3
PTBI22	Reliability of taxis or minicabs	77%		70%	7%	1	5
PTBI23	Cost (fares) of taxis or minicabs	63%		54%	9%	1	6
PTBI24	Availability of community transport	57%		56%	1%	2	35
PTBI25	Community transport fares	56%		56%	0%	3	60
PTBI26	Reliability of community transport	60%		58%	2%	2	24
Quality I	ndicator						
PTQI08	Provision of bus stops	89%		87%	2%	1	25

Results by Theme



## Road Safety

Number of Indicators Up or Down since last year

Type	Up 4%+	Up 0 to 3%	Down 0 to 3%	Down 4%+
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	1	0	1
Benchmark Indicator	0	0	0	6
Quality Indicator	0	0	0	0

Number of Indicators Above or Below Average

Туре	4%+ Above	Up to 3% Above	Up to 3% Below	4%+ Below
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	0	1	2
Benchmark Indicator	0	1	4	5
Quality Indicator	0	0	0	1

#### **Indicator Results**

	Results						
Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
Key Bei	nchmark Indicator						
KBI20	Road safety locally	49%	2%	57%	-8%	4	108
KBI21	Road safety environment	50%		54%	-4%	4	100
KBI22	Road safety education	48%	-6%	50%	-2%	3	80
Benchr	nark Indicator						
RSBI01	Speed limits	58%	-4%	63%	-5%	4	103
RSBI02	Speed controls (e.g. road humps)	47%	-6%	53%	-6%	4	108
RSBI03	Location of speed control measures	49%	-5%	54%	-5%	4	104
RSBI04	Safety of walking	56%		61%	-5%	4	102
RSBI05	Safety of cycling	47%		48%	-1%	3	57
RSBI06	Safety of children walking to school	50%		54%	-4%	4	103
RSBI07	Safety of children cycling to school	42%		43%	-1%	3	68
RSBI08	Road safety training/education children	51%	-6%	51%	0%	2	54
RSBI09	Road safety education motorcycles	48%	-8%	50%	-2%	3	80
RSBI10	Road safety education young drivers	45%	-4%	48%	-3%	4	97
Quality	Indicator						
RSQI09	Provision of speed controls	54%		64%	-10%	4	109

Results by Theme



## **Tackling Congestion**

Number of Indicators Up or Down since last year

Туре	Up 4%+	Up 0 to 3%	Down 0 to 3%	Down 4%+
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	1	1	0
Key Quality Indicator	0	1	0	0
Benchmark Indicator	0	0	5	2
Quality Indicator	0	0	0	0

Number of Indicators Above or Below Average

Туре	4%+ Above	Up to 3% Above	Up to 3% Below	4%+ Below
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	1	0	2
Key Quality Indicator	0	0	1	0
Benchmark Indicator	0	6	4	1
Quality Indicator	1	3	0	0

#### **Indicator Results**

Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
Key Ben	chmark Indicator						
KBI17	Traffic levels & congestion	41%	1%	46%	-5%	4	91
KBI18	Management of roadworks	50%	-3%	50%	0%	3	58
KBI19	Traffic management	38%		42%	-4%	4	90
Key Qua	ality Indicator						
KQI04	Traffic pollution	43%	1%	45%	-2%	3	74
Benchm	ark Indicator						
TCBI01	Advanced warning of roadworks	57%	-7%	60%	-3%	4	87
TCBI02	Efforts to reduce delays to traffic	49%	-3%	49%	0%	2	51
TCBI03	Time taken to complete roadworks	43%	-4%	43%	0%	3	60
TCBI04	Signposting of road diversions	58%	-2%	56%	2%	2	34
TCBI05	Helplines to find out about roadworks	45%	-3%	44%	1%	2	44
TCBI06	Minimising nuisance to residents	49%	-2%	49%	0%	3	59
TCBI07	The management of roadworks overall	50%	-2%	49%	1%	2	46
TCBI11	Tackling illegal onstreet parking	34%		37%	-3%	4	89
TCBI12	Restrictions of parking on busy roads	40%		43%	-3%	4	90

# 2020 Authority Annual Report Results by Theme





Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
TCBI13	Good park and ride schemes	38%		45%	-7%	4	84
TCBI14	The routes taken by HGV's	39%		42%	-3%	4	85
Quality	Indicator						
TCQI19	Informed about local pollution levels	38%		37%	1%	3	24
TCQI22	Support for congestion charge scheme	44%		42%	2%	2	25
TCQI23	Travel less by car	44%		40%	4%	2	7
TCQI24	Walk, cycle or use public transport more	46%		45%	1%	2	37

Results by Theme



## Walking & Cycling

Number of Indicators Up or Down since last year

Туре	Up 4%+	Up 0 to 3%	Down 0 to 3%	Down 4%+
Key Benchmark Indicator	0	2	1	1
Benchmark Indicator	0	0	6	6
Quality Indicator	0	0	0	0

Number of Indicators Above or Below Average

Туре	4%+ Above	Up to 3% Above	Up to 3% Below	4%+ Below
Key Benchmark Indicator	1	4	1	0
Benchmark Indicator	10	5	5	3
Quality Indicator	0	2	0	0

#### Indicator Results

Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
Key Bend	hmark Indicator						
KBI11	Pavements & footpaths (overall)	58%	0%	55%	3%	1	25
KBI12	Pavements & footpaths (aspects)	52%	-4%	54%	-2%	4	90
KBI13	Cycle routes and facilities (overall)	52%	-2%	49%	3%	1	19
KBI14	Cycle routes and facilities (aspects)	51%		46%	5%	1	12
KBI15	Rights of Way (overall)	57%	1%	57%	0%	2	52
KBI16	Rights of Way (aspects)	54%		52%	2%	1	24
Benchm	ark Indicator						
WCBI01	The provision of pavements	61%	-7%	63%	-2%	4	89
WCBI02	The condition of pavements	51%	-7%	52%	-1%	3	59
WCBI03	The cleanliness of pavements	42%	-7%	48%	-6%	4	93
WCBI04	Direction signposts for pedestrians	58%	-2%	59%	-1%	3	63
WCBI05	Provision of safe crossing points	56%	-4%	60%	-4%	4	101
WCBI06	Drop kerb crossing points	56%	-3%	59%	-3%	4	95
WCBI07	Pavements clear of obstruction	37%	-2%	41%	-4%	4	90
WCBI10	Condition of cycle routes	56%	-2%	52%	4%	1	15
WCBI11	Cycle crossing facilities at junctions	53%	-1%	48%	5%	1	8

# 2020 Authority Annual Report Results by Theme





Ref	Indicator	Result	Trend	Average	Gap	Quartile	Rank
WCBI12	Cycle parking	49%	-3%	44%	5%	1	9
WCBI13	Direction signing for cycle routes	52%	-4%	48%	4%	1	16
WCBI14	Cycle route information e.g. maps	48%	-6%	43%	5%	1	13
WCBI17	Footpaths for walking/running	63%		62%	1%	2	37
WCBI18	Bridleways for horse riding/cycling	58%		57%	1%	2	38
WCBI19	Signposting of rights of way	60%		56%	4%	1	10
WCBI20	Condition of rights of way	57%		56%	1%	2	31
WCBI21	Ease of use by those with disabilities	49%		45%	4%	1	19
WCBI22	Information on rights of way	50%		48%	2%	1	18
WCBI23	Overgrown footpaths and bridleways	41%		42%	-1%	3	64
WCBI27	The number of cycle lanes provided	50%		44%	6%	1	13
WCBI28	The number of cycle routes provided	51%		45%	6%	1	13
WCBI29	The location of the cycle lanes provided	52%		46%	6%	1	9
WCBI30	The location of the cycle routes provided	51%		48%	3%	1	23
Quality Ir	ndicator						
WCQI15	Provision of cycle routes	53%		51%	2%	1	32
WCQI16	Provision of cycle lanes	49%		47%	2%	2	33

**Group Comparisons** 



## Comparisons with other Groups

The table below shows how Bradford's results for each Key Benchmark Indicator in this year's Survey compare with the highest, lowest and average results reported in each of their nominated comparison Groups.

Group Name	Group Type	High	Average	Low	Bradford	Gap
KBI 00 - Overall Satisfaction						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	56	52	45	53	1
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	58	52	45	53	1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	54	52	45	53	1
LCRIG	Alliance	58	51	44	53	2
LGTAG	Alliance	60	53	48	53	0
WYCA	Alliance	54	52	45	53	1
KBl 01 - Importance vs Satisfaction (loca	al)					
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	58	54	50	55	1
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	59	54	49	55	1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	56	54	50	55	1
LCRIG	Alliance	57	53	49	55	2
LGTAG	Alliance	60	54	51	55	1
WYCA	Alliance	56	54	50	55	1
KBl 02 - Importance vs Satisfaction (nat	ional)					
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	58	54	51	54	0
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	59	54	49	54	0
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	56	54	51	54	0
LCRIG	Alliance	57	53	49	54	1
LGTAG	Alliance	60	54	51	54	0
WYCA	Alliance	56	54	51	54	0
KBI 03 - Ease of Access (all)						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	79	77	74	75	-2
Generated at 21/10/2020 16:11					http://www.nh	itnetwork.org

**Group Comparisons** 



Group Name	Group Type	High	Average	Low	Bradford	Gap
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	79	76	74	75	-1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	79	76	74	75	-1
LCRIG	Alliance	79	76	73	75	-1
LGTAG	Alliance	80	77	74	75	-2
WYCA	Alliance	79	76	74	75	-1
KBI 04 - Ease of Access (disabilities)						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	71	65	59	67	2
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	73	66	59	67	1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	71	68	65	67	-1
LCRIG	Alliance	74	66	59	67	1
LGTAG	Alliance	72	67	60	67	0
WYCA	Alliance	71	68	65	67	-1
KBl 05 - Ease of Access (no car)						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	75	69	60	69	0
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	77	70	60	69	-1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	74	71	69	69	-2
LCRIG	Alliance	80	69	54	69	0
LGTAG	Alliance	79	70	54	69	-1
WYCA	Alliance	74	71	69	69	-2
KBl 06 - Local bus services (overall)						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	70	61	52	66	5
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	71	62	52	66	4
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	66	62	58	66	4
LCRIG	Alliance	74	60	47	66	6
LGTAG	Alliance	79	61	51	66	5
WYCA	Alliance	66	62	58	66	4

**Group Comparisons** 



Group Name	Group Type	High	Average	Low	Bradford	Gap
KBI 07 - Local bus services (aspects)						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	70	58	41	59	1
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	69	57	41	59	2
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	69	60	53	59	-1
LCRIG	Alliance	78	56	42	59	3
LGTAG	Alliance	81	59	47	59	0
WYCA	Alliance	69	60	53	59	-1
KBI 08 - Public transport information						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	53	45	34	46	1
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	56	47	34	46	-1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	52	47	42	46	-1
LCRIG	Alliance	64	42	23	46	4
LGTAG	Alliance	73	46	35	46	0
WYCA	Alliance	52	47	42	46	-1
KBI 09 - Taxi/mini cab services						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	73	66	58	73	7
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	73	70	62	73	3
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	73	69	66	73	4
LCRIG	Alliance	73	66	56	73	7
LGTAG	Alliance	73	67	60	73	6
WYCA	Alliance	73	69	66	73	4
KBI 10 - Community Transport						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	62	58	56	61	3
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	65	59	54	61	2
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	61	58	56	61	3
LCRIG	Alliance	62	57	53	61	4

Generated at 21/10/2020 16:11

http://www.nhtnetwork.org

**Group Comparisons** 



Group Name	Group Type	High	Average	Low	Bradford	Gap
LGTAG	Alliance	63	58	56	61	3
WYCA	Alliance	61	58	56	61	3
KBl 11 - Pavements & Footpaths (overall	l)					
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	67	56	50	58	2
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	67	54	45	58	4
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	61	58	51	58	0
LCRIG	Alliance	62	54	43	58	4
LGTAG	Alliance	65	55	46	58	3
WYCA	Alliance	61	58	51	58	0
KBl 12 - Pavements & Footpaths (aspect	ts)					
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	58	55	51	52	-3
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	60	53	48	52	-1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	58	55	51	52	-3
LCRIG	Alliance	60	54	49	52	-2
LGTAG	Alliance	61	54	50	52	-2
WYCA	Alliance	58	55	51	52	-3
KBI 13 - Cycle routes and facilities (overa	all)					
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	55	49	43	52	3
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	56	49	41	52	3
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	55	50	47	52	2
LCRIG	Alliance	56	48	41	52	4
LGTAG	Alliance	56	51	47	52	1
WYCA	Alliance	55	50	47	52	2
KBI 14 - Cycle routes and facilities (aspec	cts)					
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	54	46	40	51	5
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	53	46	40	51	5

Generated at 21/10/2020 16:11

http://www.nhtnetwork.org

**Group Comparisons** 



Group Name	Group Type	High	Average	Low	Bradford	Gap
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	54	48	45	51	3
LCRIG	Alliance	54	46	40	51	5
LGTAG	Alliance	54	48	44	51	3
WYCA	Alliance	54	48	45	51	3
KBI 15 - Rights of way (overall)						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	63	58	54	57	-1
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	63	57	54	57	0
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	60	58	56	57	-1
LCRIG	Alliance	61	57	54	57	0
LGTAG	Alliance	63	57	54	57	0
WYCA	Alliance	60	58	56	57	-1
KBl 16 - Rights of way (aspects)						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	57	52	48	54	2
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	57	52	48	54	2
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	54	52	48	54	2
LCRIG	Alliance	57	52	48	54	2
LGTAG	Alliance	60	53	50	54	1
WYCA	Alliance	54	52	48	54	2
KBI 17 - Traffic levels & congestion						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	56	45	35	41	-4
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	54	44	35	41	-3
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	48	41	35	41	0
LCRIG	Alliance	56	45	33	41	-4
LGTAG	Alliance	58	47	33	41	-6
WYCA	Alliance	48	41	35	41	0
KBl 18 - Management of roadworks						





Group Name	Group Type	High	Average	Low	Bradford	Gap
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	54	50	44	50	0
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	55	49	44	50	1
West Yorkshire	<b>Combined Authorities</b>	54	49	44	50	1
LCRIG	Alliance	55	50	44	50	0
LGTAG	Alliance	56	51	44	50	-1
WYCA	Alliance	54	49	44	50	1
KBI 19 - Traffic management						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	52	42	34	38	-4
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	47	41	34	38	-3
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	52	41	34	38	-3
LCRIG	Alliance	52	42	34	38	-4
LGTAG	Alliance	57	42	36	38	-4
WYCA	Alliance	52	41	34	38	-3
KBI 20 - Road safety locally						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	61	56	49	49	-7
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	61	55	49	49	-6
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	60	54	49	49	-5
LCRIG	Alliance	63	56	49	49	-7
LGTAG	Alliance	64	58	49	49	-9
WYCA	Alliance	60	54	49	49	-5
KBl 21 - Road safety environment						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	56	53	48	50	-3
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	56	53	48	50	-3
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	56	51	48	50	-1
LCRIG	Alliance	57	53	48	50	-3
LGTAG	Alliance	60	54	49	50	-4

**Group Comparisons** 



Group Name	Group Type	High	Average	Low	Bradford	Gap
WYCA	Alliance	56	51	48	50	-1
KBI 22 - Road safety education						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	53	49	45	48	-1
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	54	49	45	48	-1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	51	49	45	48	-1
LCRIG	Alliance	55	49	45	48	-1
LGTAG	Alliance	56	51	46	48	-3
WYCA	Alliance	51	49	45	48	-1
KBI 23 - Condition of highways						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	52	37	25	40	3
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	52	36	25	40	4
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	44	36	25	40	4
LCRIG	Alliance	46	35	22	40	5
LGTAG	Alliance	46	37	27	40	3
WYCA	Alliance	44	36	25	40	4
KBI 24 - Highway maintenance						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	55	50	44	48	-2
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	55	49	42	48	-1
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	54	49	44	48	-1
LCRIG	Alliance	55	49	43	48	-1
LGTAG	Alliance	56	50	45	48	-2
WYCA	Alliance	54	49	44	48	-1
KBI 25 - Street lighting						
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	73	67	62	63	-4
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	73	65	56	63	-2
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	70	66	62	63	-3

Generated at 21/10/2020 16:11

http://www.nhtnetwork.org





Group Name	Group Type	High	Average	Low	Bradford	Gap	
LCRIG	Alliance	71	63	51	63	0	
LGTAG	Alliance	70	64	55	63	-1	
WYCA	Alliance	70	66	62	63	-3	
KBI 26 - Highway enforcement/obstructions							
Yorkshire & Humberside	Region	50	44	40	44	0	
Metropolitan Borough	Peer Group	48	44	40	44	0	
West Yorkshire	Combined Authorities	50	45	40	44	-1	
LCRIG	Alliance	50	44	38	44	0	
LGTAG	Alliance	51	46	43	44	-2	
WYCA	Alliance	50	45	40	44	-1	