

M Le-Roy and A Thomas  
Milton Keynes Forum C'ttee  
City Discovery Centre  
Bradwell Abbey  
Milton Keynes  
MK13 9AP

**Brian Sandom**  
**Corporate Director Environment**

**Nick Fenwick**  
**Head of Planning**

**Our Ref:**

**Your Ref:**

**Reply To:** R Wilson

**Direct Line:** (01908) 252480

**E-Mail:** bob.wilson@milton-  
keynes.gov.uk

07 December 2009

Dear Sirs,

**Core Strategy: MK Forum's concerns about CMK**

Thank you for your letter and attachment addressed to Councillor Galloway of 23 November. As requested I made arrangements to meet with A Thomas after the Local Development Framework Group meeting on 17 November. On Andrew's request I also arranged to have B Matthews as well as J Harper there and this meant the earliest date all three officers could attend was Wednesday 25 November at 2.00.p.m. I did try to move the meeting to noon but this could not happen because of previous commitments. I apologise if this caused problems for you.

As you are aware the Cabinet did not approve the Core Strategy for consideration by council in December. This allows more time to achieve a mutual understanding between us on your concerns about Central Milton Keynes.

As agreed by e-mail (dated 25 November between A Thomas and myself), I have discussed your letter and note of 23 November with colleagues in the Transport Department and the points raised are addressed in the response set out below. The response deals with your letter and then the note.

In your letter you explain your issue is not about mere figures and you suggest there has been insufficient integration of six aspects of the plan. These relate to the scale of growth planned for the centre and the transport implications. You also claim there are gaps in evidence that make the Core Strategy flawed in this respect.

On page 3 of your letter it is important to recognise the figure of 23,398 is an all day figure and so applying this to the rush hour, exaggerates the impact and this is discussed further in the comments on your note below. It is worth noting that the surveys of the current car parking spaces show they are not fully taken up. It is also

important to recognise it is an illustration of the nature and scale of behavioural change. It does not represent known outputs from specific interventions.

It is agreed that more trips into the centre will need to be made by public transport in the future but given the spare capacity on the bus vehicles at present, a doubling of trips can be accommodated without additional numbers of vehicles. If all the vehicles were double-deckers, then roughly a tripling of trips could be accommodated with the same number of vehicles.

Turning to your note which has a useful summary at the beginning, you refer to a need to increase the use of public transport by a factor of ten to enable people to move in the period to 2026 and beyond.

The summary of information held in the various studies you quote is accepted. However, the following comment is necessary against your conclusions about the Public Transport Long Term Vision:

c) The quote about a ten fold increase in public transport trips is not a recommendation in the PTLTV. The PTLTV only refers to this increase to highlight the scale of the challenge. Further on in the PTLTV in chapter 7 there is a review of the broad assessments of public transport options, which includes tables (7.1a and b) to show potential mode changes and these are all significantly below a ten fold increase:

**Table 7.1a Forecast Mode Share with MKPT land use (Option A) assumptions**

			Busway		GLT		LRT		
		Do min	Bus Imp	E-W	E-W+N-S	E-W	E-W+N-S	E-W	E-W+N-S
2011	PT Share of all modes	3.9%	5.8%						
	PT Share of motorised Modes	5.4%	8.1%						
2021	PT Share of all modes	5.2%	8.0%	8.8%	9.7%	9.1%	10.3%	9.5%	11.1%
	PT Share of motorised Modes	7.2%	11.2%	12.3%	13.5%	12.7%	14.4%	13.3%	15.6%
2031	PT Share of all modes	7.1%	9.3%	10.4%	11.3%	10.9%	12.1%	11.6%	13.1%
	PT Share of motorised Modes	10.0%	13.1%	14.6%	15.8%	15.3%	16.9%	16.2%	18.3%

**Table 7.1b Forecast Mode Share with MKAV land use (Option B) assumptions**

			Busway		GLT		LRT		
		Do min	Bus Imp	E-W	E-W+N-S	E-W	E-W+N-S	E-W	E-W+N-S
2011	PT Share of all modes	3.8%	5.8%						
	PT Share of motorised Modes	5.4%	8.1%						
2021	PT Share of all modes	5.1%	7.9%	8.7%	9.5%	8.9%	10.1%	9.3%	10.9%
	PT Share of motorised Modes	7.1%	11.1%	12.1%	13.4%	12.5%	14.2%	13.1%	15.3%
2031	PT Share of all modes	7.0%	9.2%	10.1%	11.0%	10.5%	11.7%	11.1%	12.5%
	PT Share of motorised Modes	9.8%	12.9%	14.2%	15.4%	14.8%	16.4%	15.5%	17.5%

It is important to appreciate that the mode shares set out in Tables 7.1a and b, refer to trips over the whole of Milton Keynes. Share of public transport trips to CMK is estimated to be typically 50% higher than that estimated for the whole of Milton Keynes.

Chapter 8 states the mode share targets in the 1999 S.I.T.S. are unrealistic.

On page 3 of your note you refer to the increasing need to reserve the majority of public parking for short stay uses. This is not policy of the council and is only an assumption proposed by the Forum. The need for review is acknowledged in the CMK Development Framework and in the PTLTV.

Your penultimate paragraph on page 3 of your note does not recognise the fact that new developments in some cases will provide their own car parking, e.g. the new Sainsbury's store and the permission for the redeveloped Leisure Plaza. Another matter omitted from your comments is recognition of the fact that not all workers will arrive or work at the same time. There is also flexibility given the number of part-time employees working in the centre.

To conclude, it is agreed that change in travel behaviour is required in the future and measures such as improved public transport, park and ride, travel planning, increased cycling and walking will all assist in delivering this change. The Local Development Framework Advisory Group agreed to add transport to the key issues at the front of the Core Strategy. Whilst the direction of change is agreed, it is important to recognise that proposals in the Core Strategy and indeed the Local Transport Plan have to be realistic and deliverable. That is, the proposals must be resourced and politically acceptable. Given our current assumptions on modal shift, the scale of development for Central Milton Keynes is deliverable. It is for these reasons the approach suggested in the Core Strategy is considered more appropriate. If you consider a meeting would be useful please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely



**R Wilson**  
**Development Plans Manager**