

**ASSESSMENT OF LTP 1 DELIVERY AS EVIDENCED IN JULY 2006 REPORT****LTP AREA: Milton Keynes**

Region: South East

Document Version and Date: 21.12.06

**Section A: A1 - Road Safety Strategy Delivery****Summary of Assessment:**

Milton Keynes has made good progress against its road safety strategy. Partnership working is well demonstrated by the authority and there is evidence of strong performance shown with regards to data-led management of the network and sustained use of substantial resources on safety education, training and publicity.

However it should be noted that there are discrepancies between the data contained within the Delivery Report and that used for the assessment against target progress. The Dept for Transport has agreed revised 1994-98 baseline figures have been agreed with Thames Valley local authorities, where it has been shown that the casualty severity split prior to a certain date was incorrectly represented. This is the case for Milton Keynes and the figures in the document are incorrect. The revised baselines have been used by DfT to monitor local highway authority progress against the casualty reduction targets. Nevertheless, good progress has been made and the adjusted base-line figures show that KSI figures have reduced by 35%, while child KSI figures have reduced by some 24%. The KSI figure represents a strong performance while the Child KSI target is very nearly on track. There is a similar problem for the 'slight' casualty statistics and the adjusted figures show an increase in casualties of some 12%; this is not on track.

Minimum Requirements	Met?	Evidence & Comments
<p>Delivery report summarises progress on local casualty reduction targets up to 2005 and provides credible explanations for any targets not achieved.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>According to the Delivery Report (Page 42), Milton Keynes is reducing KSIs by 39% and Child KSIs by 46%. However there is an issue over the reported data which is described in the Summary above. Good progress has been made (if less impressive than those reported in the DR) and the revised figures show that KSI figures have reduced by 35%, while child KSI figures have reduced by some 24%. The KSI figure represents a strong performance while the Child KSI target is very nearly on track.</p> <p>The adjusted figures are as follows. All KSI is on track, revised base-line is 188, vs. 2005 result of 122 (-35%). Child KSIs revised base-line = 25, achieved in 2005 = 19, therefore (-24%). The 2005 figure recorded in the Delivery Report is shown as 13 – but DfT figure is confirmed as 19.</p> <p>It should also be noted that local road accident casualties (BVPI 99) is reported as not on track (Page 56). There has been a similar data problem (as to that described above) in respect of these ‘slight’ casualties, and the adjusted figures show a 12% increase in this figure. This is not on track. [DfT figures, RCGB 2005 – adjusted base-line = 1072, achieved 2005 figure = 1203 : which gives an increase of 12.2%.] The Delivery Report states (p56) that the accident figures include accidents on the M1 and A5 which are outside Milton Keynes’ control (credible explanation), though it is noted that the figures are higher than those reported and the split between accidents on trunk roads and local roads is not made clear. We would have liked to see greater evidence behind this explanation.</p>
<p>Delivery report summarises achievement of local safety strategy including.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one substantial contribution made by a local partner or partnership to delivery</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes (Page 56). Local partner example: Page 17. ‘For My Girlfriend’ campaign launched in partnership with Buckinghamshire Fire &amp; Rescue, Two Shires Ambulance Trust Paramedics and Shopping Centre Management. Page 56. Asked Thames Valley Road Safety Partnership to consider safety improvements to the A421 following a series of fatal accidents on this road.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance on total casualties with credible explanations of any increases over the baseline.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Page 56. Total number of road accident casualties is not on track – so not good. However it has reduced by 4% during the LTP period and has fallen year on year since it was recorded in 2003/04 (see p5 of APR5). So there has been progress and there have been no increases over the baseline.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary table of the impact of the 5 year programme of local safety schemes.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Page 57. Table suggests that delivery of 19 road safety schemes has saved 30.8 personal injury accidents.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of the impact of education, training and publicity measures</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes, in the main. Page 57-58. Much effort targeted at schools, though little evidence of any real impact.</p>

	<p>BBC Three Counties Radio holds a monthly half-hour phone-in on road safety. A sponsorship deal with MK Dons FC enables road safety info to be passed on to fans. Also provide info in the match day programme.</p>
<p><b>Are all the minimum requirements evidenced sufficiently? Yes</b></p>	

Benchmarks of Strong Delivery	Met?	Evidence & Comments
1. Stretching targets achieved	No	1. See discussion above with regard to data-set discrepancies. Adjusted figures put KSI reduction at 35%, not the 40% reported in the Delivery Report (eg Page 15 Section 3.3). This still represents good performance, but the Child KSI (reduced by 24%) is not on target. The stretch target calculation used by DfT Road Safety Division marks this benchmark as a “no”.
2. Strong performance on slight injury casualty levels. (This must involve a reduction in the number of slight casualties)	No	2. The total number of ‘slights’ has increased by 12% - see the summary discussion above.
3. Strong data-led management of the network, including embedding of road safety outcomes into other LTP work (eg maintenance) and evidence of a speed management strategy.	Yes	3. Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some evidence of road safety is imbedded into Land-Use policy eg. Local Plan has traffic-calming policy that states new schemes should be developed to form an integral part of street design. (Page 59).</li> <li>• Data-led examples include, on Page 58, reports of RTA injuries sent by Thames Valley Police and analysed on ‘AccsMap’. Where 7 or more collisions occur in a 3-year period, engineering measures will be considered. A Road Safety Engineer is now in post, and an increase in road safety audits is being experienced.</li> <li>• Safer Routes To Schools data is used to rank schools, with appropriate solutions designed for schools at the top of the list.</li> <li>• Evidence of speed management strategy seems to be limited to school-based projects (Page 59).</li> </ul>
4. Sustained use of substantial resources and delivery of outputs for data-led road safety education, training & publicity, with key & significant impacts demonstrated.	Yes	4. Local safety schemes accounted for around 10% (about £2.2 million) of total net capital spend through the LTP1 period. (Source APR5 LTPF3).
5. Major outputs from partnerships with the key stakeholders (including related to health, planning and the police).	Yes	Data-led E, T & P. (Page 58). Light on evidence here. Although active on this front, ETP activity seems to be aimed at vulnerable groups eg schoolchildren, rather than data-led initiatives per se. Motorcyclists too are a vulnerable road user group who account for only 1% of traffic, but 25% of KSIs in 2004. This group has been targeted with a safer rider education initiative in partnership with the Institute of Advanced Motorcyclists and Thames Valley Police (Page 58). On balance this scores a ‘Yes’.  5. Page 56. Joined up with Milton Keynes Safety Centre (20,000children/year visited) for an open day. Page 58 - Arranged a Rider Event in partnership with TV Police and the Institute of Advanced Motorcyclists Groups. Schools are encouraged to develop travel plans alongside ‘Safer Routes To Schools’ schemes.

**What other evidence not covered above do you consider demonstrates very strong delivery?**

<b>Questions on assessment of strong delivery</b>	Number of Benchmarks for which strong delivery demonstrated: 3/5	No
Has strong delivery been demonstrated by more than <u>two thirds</u> of the benchmarks (ie 4 or 5 out of 5) being evidenced sufficiently?		No
If no has strong delivery been demonstrated by <u>more</u> than half (ie 3 or more) of the benchmarks being evidenced strongly and there being substantial <u>additional evidence</u> demonstrating strong delivery overall?		No

## A2 - Public Transport Strategy Delivery

### Summary of Assessment:

Delivery against the authority's public transport strategy is assessed as good. This is despite the fact that two of the three local public transport targets in the LTP, were not achieved ('Satisfaction of bus service information' and 'Community Transport Patronage'). The explanations as to why this occurred could have been expanded further but it is clear that the Council is positive about turning performance around and a number of proactive inputs are recorded (for example significant improvements to the web-based bus information system and the redesigned community bus service). We look forward to consequential improvements to performance in the LTP2. In addition it is reported that over the LTP1 period bus patronage grew by 11% (or almost 13% according to the core target table at Proforma A), which endorses the positive outcome of the public transport strategy.

It is clear that a number of outputs have been delivered in the plan period including two bus priority lanes, extension of traffic management (UTMC), the introduction of PRISM at two junctions to give bus priority, and improvements to a number of bus stops in partnership with MK metro. The reporting of the impact of these outputs is less strong (for example in terms of bus priority measures) and this should be improved for the next LTP. Enhancements for the next LTP period seem to be in place with the proposed Central Milton Keynes public transport access improvements scheme prioritised for delivery in the near future.

Minimum Requirements	Met?	Evidence & Comments
<p><b>Bus Strategy</b> Evidence of the LTP1 investment made in bus priority measures delivering monitored benefits to bus passengers cost effectively.</p>	Yes	<p>Pages 52 &amp; 53. Bus priority lanes installed along Avebury &amp; Midsummer Boulevards and North Grafton Roundabout. "Observations" show they have neither hindered buses nor other traffic. Whilst it is clear that investment has been made, it isn't clear what "observations" mean, and the monitoring of consequences seems light. For example, there is no mention of increased punctuality, journey time improvements or passenger satisfaction. But saying that, there's been an impressive growth in patronage. Traffic management (UTMC) has been extended, and PRISM introduced at two junctions to give bus priority, (as part of an EP bid to ODPM). On balance we have given this a "Yes" mark.</p>
<p>Evidence of partnership between authority and operators to promote and improve key services.</p>	Yes	<p>Page 52. A number of improvements were made to bus stops in partnership with MK Metro, including level access kerbs and a new design of bus shelter on several routes across the quality bus initiative network. MK Metro has also invested in new buses to make best use of improved facilities.</p>
<p>Achievement of local outcome indicators for public transport or credible explanation for their non-achievement.</p>	Yes	<p>In terms of local targets three local targets are reported on (Page 53). Two out of three were not achieved:  <u>Satisfaction of bus service information</u> (BVPI 103) did NOT ACHIEVE the target.  <u>Community Transport patronage</u> has been growing but did NOT ACHIEVE its target.  <u>Cost per passenger of contracted service</u> – target cost of £2.50 was ACHIEVED.</p> <p>The Council are positive about turning this outcome performance around for both the underachieving targets.</p> <p>In terms of satisfaction of bus service information, the authority was disappointed with the result of the survey but it is reported that significant improvements were made to the web-based info since the survey was undertaken. The introduction of real time information will also help as will the re-design of the paper-based information which was to be launched in July 2006 (see 2<sup>nd</sup> column of p53).</p> <p>The Community Patronage figures declined despite increased resources. Again however the authority has been proactive and has completely redesigned the service with new vehicles and a new booking facility. A target to double use has been set for LTP2. (see 2<sup>nd</sup> column of p53).</p> <p>The Report would have benefited from a greater explanation as to why it is felt that these targets have not been hit – however it is clear that the authority has been proactive about putting the situation right and as such this benchmark has been awarded a 'yes' mark.</p>

		<p>It should also be noted that over the life of the LTP1 bus patronage (the core target BV102) is reported to have increased by 11% (p53). This figure should actually be 13% (12.6%) as reported in Proforma A, the LTP1 Core Indicator Table that appears towards the end of the Report. This is quite an increase and is a positive outcome of the LTP1's public transport strategy.</p> <p>It should also be noted however that local targets for the number of journeys to work (Public Transport trips, actual and by mode), were reported in APR5. There have been difficulties in reporting these targets and these seem to have been dropped in the Delivery Report. This has caused a few assessment problems throughout the document – notably in relation to the parking strategy.</p>
<p><b>PT Information Strategy</b> Evidence of an improved overall standard of bus information or a stronger council contribution to bus information.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Page 55. A web-based travel guide was developed with all timetables available in this format. Hard copies are now available as a fold-out map &amp; guide and published twice a year. It is also noted that for the future, Central MK PT access enhancements (not in the original LTP1) will deliver real-time bus passenger information which, it is hoped, will reverse the decline in customer satisfaction with PT information.</p>
<p><b>Are all the minimum requirements evidenced sufficiently? YES</b></p>		



Benchmarks of Strong Delivery	Met?	Evidence & Comments
<b>Bus Strategy</b> 1. Substantial improvements to services and networks across the LTP area.	Yes	1. On balance, yes. For example, on Page 52, bus frequency on Route 5 (which links a high proportion of non-car owning households) increased to 10 minutes. North Grafton roundabout was redesigned and bus priority extended on Avebury and Midsummer Boulevards.
2. Major outputs delivered by partnerships, such as substantial showcase routes	Yes	2. Page 52. Above bus priority measures carried out at the request of MK Metro (Milton Keynes' largest bus operator). A joint bid with English Partnerships (EP) to fund Central MK PT access improvements was accepted as a committed scheme under the SE Regional Funding Allocation process for funding over the next three years. Page 53. Following a successful bid by EP, the Traffic Management & Bus Priority Scheme is now in place (includes 140 improved bus stops with raised kerb access to low-floor buses, and new bus shelters with real-time passenger information).
3. Substantial integration of conventional bus services with health and community transport and the voluntary sector.	No	3. Not clear. Pages 42 & 52 make reference to a good example - the 'Hanslope Harrier' demand-responsive bus which was introduced linking main shopping areas and the hospital. But this is but one example and it is not clear whether this is run in partnership with the operator. The 2005/06 Community Transport Review led to a new booking service and taxi card system, but there is no mention of the voluntary sector. Lots going on but not clear whether it meets the criteria. On balance this benchmark has been marked as a 'No'.
4. Delivery of stretching local outcome indicators	No	4. No. 2 out of 3 were not delivered, and there is no indication that the one achieved has been stretched.
5. ** Delivery of substantial increases in park and ride, at least equivalent to the proposals in the LTP1 strategy.	Yes	5. Page 19. A permanent P&R was introduced between Coachway and Central MK, based on success of two Christmas P&Rs from the National Bowl and the Coachway to Central MK.
<b>PT Information Strategy</b> 6. Evidence of strong and sustained partnerships and commitment to promote and improve public transport information.	Yes	6. Page 53. MK & English Partnerships successfully secured funding for the CMK Traffic Management and Bus Priority scheme. This included improvements to 140 bus stops and new shelters capable of Real Time Passenger Information. Much evidence of partnership working in relation to growth see references to Milton Keynes Partnership eg (p53).

## ITEM 5 ANNEX B

7. Delivery of local outcome indicators for public transport information	No	7. None stated other than BVPI 103, which is reported below.
8. Strong or improved performance as monitored by BVPI 103.	No	8. Although the new bus publicity launched in Summer 2006 coupled with improved web-based PT information, should increase customer satisfaction with bus service information (BVPI 103), performance up to now has not been strong. The local target has not been achieved, with only 34% overall very or fairly satisfied. So "No" awarded to this benchmark.
<b>Taking account of passenger rail</b> 9. ** Delivery of substantially improved integration, in which the LA/PTE is a key partner	No	9. Page 54. The Council is developing an East-West Rail project with DFT Rail Group and partners. Currently at pre-feasibility stage, the scheme would support sustainable development. This scheme has been taken forward during the LTP1 period but we are a long way from delivery. Improvements have not been delivered yet so this remains a "No".
10. ** Delivery of substantial outputs (e.g. new rail stations, new rail based park and ride) by the LA at a level at least consistent with its LTP1 strategy.	Yes	10. Page 54. A CIF bid to improve MK Central and Wolverton Rail Stations was submitted in November 2004. Still to be delivered but the MK Central Station major rail upgrade has since been approved (at £30M, including £6M developer contribution). On balance this has scored a "yes" mark.
<b>The role of taxis and private hire vehicles</b> 11. Substantial innovative use of taxis as part of the wider transport system and substantial integration of policies for taxis into other transport policies.	Yes	11. Page 54. Evidence is light but following 2002's deregulation, over 50 new Hackney Carriage licences have been issued. Taxis are particularly important to MK's night-time economy and, following consultation with the taxi trade and other partners/stakeholders, taxis have been permitted to use MK's bus lanes. Following extensive review of Community Transport (2005/06) improvements to services are being developed such as the introduction of a new taxi card system (Page 52). On balance, this is a 'Yes'.
<b>Public Transport Interchanges</b> 12. Achievement of stretching local outcome indicators.	No	12. No public transport local outcome indicators are reported on.
13. Delivery of substantial outputs (e.g. new interchange schemes) that are also at least equivalent to those included in the LTP1 strategy.	No	13. References made on Page 54 are all for the future and not delivered in LTP1. Improvements to four interchanges were made according to the LTPF3 at the back of the Delivery Report, and in the APR5 (which details one delivered in 2003/04). But it is simply not clear to what these refer. On balance this scores a 'No'.

**What other evidence not covered above do you consider demonstrates very strong delivery?**

None.

\*\* Benchmarks 5, 9 and 10 have been assessed for all local authorities. In some cases strong delivery has not been evidenced because Park and Ride or rail did not feature or featured marginally in the local transport plan and were not local priorities. Therefore the section above considers the case whether a strong marking is merited for the delivery of public transport strategies overall in all cases where strong delivery of seven or eight of the benchmarks has been demonstrated.

<b>Questions on assessment of strong delivery</b>	Number of Benchmarks for which strong delivery demonstrated <b>6/13</b>	<b>No</b>
Has strong delivery been demonstrated by more than <u>two thirds</u> (ie 9 or more) of the benchmarks being evidenced sufficiently?		No
If no has strong delivery been demonstrated by <u>more than half</u> ( ie 7 or more) the benchmarks being evidenced strongly and there being substantial <u>additional evidence</u> demonstrating strong delivery overall?		No

## A3 - Sustainability of Transport Policies - Delivery

### Summary of Assessment:

The authority has delivered well overall against its sustainability strategies. Strong delivery has been achieved with regard to Air Quality reduction with its three local AQ targets being achieved (relating to reductions in nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter and carbon monoxide). Over the LTP1 period Milton Keynes achieved weekly savings in commuting distances from 25K to 40K kilometres. The Council also introduced a Variable Message Signing system to show drivers the locations of available parking space, thereby cutting ‘cruising’ and pollution. Combined with an Urban Traffic Management Control system this is estimated to save motorists £3M over the next ten years. There was also some strong delivery in regard to rural accessibility with some good examples of community transport and demand-responsive bus services (eg. the Hanslope Harrier). The authority performed less well in regard to sustainable distribution (where no local indicators were set) and climate change where again performance against proxy indicators was not clear. The Report would also have benefited from more quantitative analysis of the impact of noise reduction measures.

Minimum Requirements	Met?	Evidence & Comments
<b>Airport Surface Access</b> Achievement of local outcome indicators or credible explanation for non-achievement.	N/A	
<b>Co-ordination with AQ &amp; Noise</b> Achievement of local outcome targets or credible explanation for non-achievement (if there are none then this strategy may not be assessed).	Yes	Page 17, 60. The Council achieved its three AQ targets (above) by the target date. There were no specific local noise targets, but during the LTP1 period, ‘thin surface course’ and noise attenuation barriers were used in resurfacing work to reduce the affect of noise.
<b>Action on climate change</b> Achievement of relevant local outcome targets or credible explanations for non-achievement. Relevant targets could include car mode split and road traffic levels (all day or peak periods).	No	Page 60. The argument is not clear. MK are not reporting against the modal split targets set in previous APRs because of unrealism and monitoring problems, yet some performance figures are put forward. We need to follow one or the other – if they are not reporting officially against these targets (and they were not being recorded under PT performance), we have to mark this benchmark as not achieved.  Page 60. Stated that a new survey method was used that showed traffic flows across Central MK cordon dropped by 7% (between 2003 and 2005), bus patronage rose by 8% (7.30-9.30am). However, no targets are quoted so we can’t say whether local outcome targets were on track. Page 24. MK’s Core Cycling target was up by 29% but not met.
<b>Needs of the countryside</b> Achievement of the target for the accessibility core indicator or a credible	Yes	Page 61. Rural households within 800m of hourly or better bus service remained at 77%.

## ITEM 5 ANNEX B

<p>explanation for its non achievement.</p>		<p>There were further increases in rural accessibility (see discussion about the Hanslope Harrier demand-responsive bus service and community transport on Page 42), but these are not conventional bus services and are not counted in the accessibility figures.</p>
<p><b>Sustainable distribution</b>          Achievement of local outcome indicators related to sustainable distribution or credible explanations for their non achievement. Relevant targets could include travel times on key routes (if there are none then this strategy may not be assessed).</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No local outcome indicators were set for sustainable distribution.</p>
<p><b>Note: Assessors have considered enough, but not necessarily all, of the five areas listed above to decide whether at least two comply with the minimum requirements. So the table above may not be completed for all five strategy areas. Airport surface access is only relevant to some LTPs.</b></p>		
<p><b>Are the minimum requirements evidenced sufficiently for at least two of the five strategy areas above? Yes</b></p>		

Benchmarks of Strong Delivery	Met?	Evidence & Comments
<p><b>Airport Surface Access (Only applicable to some LTPs)</b></p> <p>1. Challenging LTP1 targets achieved or substantial stretch achieved</p> <p>2. Delivery of substantial improvements to surface access by the local authority with evidence of impacts.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>1. N/A</p> <p>2. N/A</p>
<p><b>Co-ordination with Air Quality &amp; Noise</b></p> <p>3. Demonstration of significant reductions in contribution of road transport to pollution problems attributable to the local authority's action in air quality management areas or other hotspots.</p> <p>4. Suitable delivery of traffic management measures directly related to improving air quality.</p> <p>5. Delivery of substantial reductions in noise exposure due to the local authority's actions</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>	<p>3. Page 60. Over the LTP1 period,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• weekly savings in commuting distances went from 25K to 40K kilometres</li> <li>• weekly reductions in nitrogen oxides from 20 to 40Kg</li> <li>• weekly savings in fuel increased from 1850 to 3200 litres.</li> </ul> <p>4. Page 17. A Variable Message Signing system was introduced to show drivers the locations of available parking space, thereby cutting 'cruising' and pollution. Combined with an Urban Traffic Management Control system this is reckoned to save motorists £3M over the next ten years (Page 60).</p> <p>5. Page 60. Work is clearly taking place. Resurfacing with 'thin surface course' reduces noise from vehicle use, and it's reported that these are used almost exclusively throughout the network (Page 66). In addition noise attenuation barriers are used on roads running close to residential areas to further reduce noise (Page 60). However this is not quantified in the Report, and as we're not given the outcome, we can't assess whether the impact has led to "substantial reductions in noise exposure". As such, this benchmark is not met.</p>

<p><b>Action on climate change</b></p> <p>6. Substantial sustained delivery of travel awareness campaigns.</p> <p>7. Quantification of the impact of the overall strategy delivered on CO2 emissions demonstrating an improvement.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>6. Light on evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web based travel guide has been developed and a travel guide in fold-out format published twice a year. (Page 55)</li> <li>• The CARSHARE MK scheme was introduced in 2002, and has been successful in delivering a number of outcomes (Page 60) but the level of publicity to promote it isn't documented.</li> </ul> <p>Sustained delivery of travel awareness campaigns is somewhat implied rather than being explicit. On balance this benchmark has not been met.</p> <p>7. Page 17. Weekly reductions in CO2 emissions rose from 4,500 to 7,300Kg.</p>
<p><b>Needs of the countryside</b></p> <p>8. Achievement of stretching levels of improvements to rural accessibility</p> <p>9. Delivery of substantial rural transport outputs (e.g. enhanced rural passenger transport services, large quiet lane projects).</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>8. The core target was achieved but not stretched.</p> <p>9. Yes. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 61. Hanslope Harrier demand-responsive bus service introduced between Handslope, Castlethorpe &amp; Haversham to Central MK and hospital.</li> <li>• The 'Quiet Lanes' project delivered speed restrictions, enhanced signage and gateways to Filgrave and Tyringham (p61).</li> <li>• Page 61. Cycling accessibility improved with new Redway links from Wavendon &amp; Woburn Sands to Kingston, and from Olney to Newport Pagnell.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sustainable distribution</b></p> <p>10. Establishment of freight quality partnerships, delivering significant outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>11. Effective implementation of substantial lorry routing strategies or strategies to transfer flows to other modes.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>10. No evidence.</p> <p>11. In part (Page 61). A higher than normal HGV traffic flow in Wavendon and Woburn Sands was addressed by putting HGV restrictions in place. But this is not considered as a substantial lorry routing strategy. It appears reactive rather than proactive and, as there is no strategy evident for transfer onto other modes, this benchmark is not considered to be achieved.</p>

<p><b>Question on assessment of strong delivery</b></p>	<p>Number of Benchmarks for which Strong Delivery Demonstrated <b>4 out of 9</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
---	--	------------------

Has strong delivery been demonstrated by more than <u>half</u> of the applicable benchmarks being evidenced sufficiently?	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

\*\* 9 benchmarks are applicable to plans where airport surface access is not applicable, 11 to others. The requirement for more than half of applicable benchmarks needing to be evidenced means that areas where one or perhaps more of the strategy areas has limited relevance need not demonstrate evidence of strong delivery in these areas to achieve overall strong delivery of sustainable transport policies.



## A4: Parking Strategy

### Summary of Assessment:

There has been some good delivery in regards to Milton Keynes' Parking Strategy. It is clear that much has been achieved and that it has been achieved with constructive consultation with interested parties. Examples include the reduction of free parking bays by some 63%, an effective car-share scheme with 2,700 members, trailing of park & ride, the introduction of decriminalised parking and the introduction of variable message signs at the same time as urban traffic management control. But there is still some way to go - there are still 5,000 free parking spaces, the overall number of parking spaces has remained static and more park & ride sites are to come on line. The LTP period suffered from unclear monitoring/reporting of traffic flows across the CMK cordon. This led to local mode-split targets being dropped during the LTP period (APR5) but with a new survey method being introduced. This has led to difficulties in assessing the impact of the strategy and we look forward to robust and consistent data in LTP2.

Minimum Requirements	Met?	Evidence and Comments
<p>1. A parking strategy implemented for the central and inner areas of the largest settlement in the plan's area, which aims to encourage mode shift away from cars, includes maximum standards for new development and on street charging in places and effective enforcement</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>MK's Parking Strategy is covered in LTP1 including CMK workplace parking, and reviewed in 2004. It included an intention to restrict supply, charge for parking and provide park and ride. This has changed over the years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of parking spaces has remained static between 2001 and 2006 (despite increased development in the area).</li> <li>• Not every space is charged for. There are still 5,000 free parking places (which is down from 13,500 at beginning of LTP period). Standard &amp; premium rates have also increased.</li> <li>• Park &amp; Ride has been trialled over Christmas periods and a partly commercial P&amp;R introduced in June 2005. Two new sites are coming on line.</li> </ul> <p><u>Modal Shift</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park &amp; Ride being brought in – albeit slowly.</li> <li>• A highly successful carshare scheme was introduced (800 members in 2003 grew to 2,700 in 2006).</li> <li>• The number of chargeable parking bays doubled from 27% to 57%.</li> <li>• Bus use over whole network increased by 11%.</li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic Management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Parking standards introduced in 2004 based on four zones and maximum standards.</li> <li>• Decriminalised parking was introduced in March 2002. The whole of the Council area is now a</li> </ul>

		<p>Special Parking Area, with the Council responsible for enforcement on the highway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-street charging (but still 5,000 free spaces).</li> <li>• Variable message signs introduced in 2002 at same time as Urban Traffic Management Control.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Achievement of local outcome indicators or credible explanations for their non-achievement.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Two local indicators relating to parking were included in the APR5 (“Number of Cars parked in CMK on a weekday at 10am” and the “%age of public parking spaces with a charge”). These seem to be part of the way of monitoring and assessing performance of MK’s target of “Decreasing the journey to work by car to 62% by 2006”, ie. a proxy. There is no specific local target for parking. Because of the problems monitoring the modal share targets (discussed on Page 60, 2<sup>nd</sup> column of the Delivery Report) these indicators are not reported in the Delivery Report. A new survey method was been developed (Page 60) which should help bring more effective monitoring in LTP2, though it is far from clear in LTP1.</p> <p>However some success is clearly being achieved. On “number of cars” this has fallen by 1% between the 2000 baseline and 2004/05. There is a trajectory set out on this (in APR5 but not the DR) and it was on target in APR5. It is not reported on separately in the Delivery Report. The “%age of charged parking” does not have a trajectory in APR5, but is reported on in the Delivery Report. The 2000 baseline was 25% of spaces with a charge. By the end of the LTP period that figure had increased to 77%, suggesting big improvements. However the initial LTP1 objective was that every parking space should have a charge, although this was subsequently changed following extensive consultation and agreement with local stakeholders.</p> <p>In summary, the indicators are far from clear but progress is being made against them. On balance this scores a “Yes”.</p>
<p><b>Are all the minimum requirements evidenced sufficiently? Yes</b></p>		

Benchmarks of Strong Delivery	Met?	Evidence and Comments
1. Implementation of a consistent and coherent strategy which brings together planning standards, charging and on street controls	Yes	Page 62. The Council has introduced a strategy of managing the parking stock with the aim of not undermining the economy of their towns and Central MK. Maximum parking standards have been introduced along with charging and de-criminalised parking.
2. Implementation of a clear strategy for effective enforcement	Yes	Page 62. Decriminalised Parking was introduced in 2002, with the Council now responsible for all highway parking, and private contractors carrying out enforcement in a zone-based framework.
3. Implementation of strategies that help to reduce the traffic levels in town centres whilst at the same time ensuring enough good quality publicly available parking to support the continuing economic viability of retail and leisure investment in these locations	Yes	Page 60. 2 <sup>nd</sup> column states that traffic flows across the CMK cordon dropped by 7% between 2003 and 2005. However the APR5 target on modal split was dropped due to problems with data capture and we have a slight concern with these figures, ie. if we have the data, why do we no longer have a local target? That aside, Page 62 states that the number of free parking bays was reduced from 13,500 in 2001 to 5,000 in 2006, and the impact on the local economy is certainly shaping the policy. The 5,000 free spaces were retained following extensive consultation and agreement with local stakeholders. Likewise, a 5-hour parking restriction imposed in 2002 was lifted in 2003, following concerns expressed by the retail industry. However although this indicates good partnership working it does raise concern over the continued high level of free parking and the implied movement away from a short-term parking strategy. MK is moving in the right direction, but these issues need to be addressed in the LTP2 plan period. On balance this scores a “Yes” mark.
4. Implementation of Strategies that discourages commuting by car, particularly into congested areas such as town centres – through charging policies and active management to favour short term visitor parking	No	Page 63. Good results on car sharing (by 2006 the scheme had attracted 2,700 members and was featured in DfT’s ‘Making Smarter Choices Work’ publication in 2005) and cycle usage and bus patronage are both reported as increasing (Page 60), as are the number of travel plans. The charging structure differentiates between premium and standard rate bays (Page 62) and results seem to be being delivered. However as discussed at Question 3 above, there is still the concern over the robustness of the data. Also, almost a quarter (23%) of parking spaces are still free and the total number of spaces has remained static over the Plan period, although it is argued that the latter is the case despite increased development in the area. (Pages 62 & 63). The strategy in favour of short-term visitor parking is also in question with the lifting of the 5-hour parking restriction. On balance this benchmark has not been fully met.
5. Where the overall amount, quality and location of publicly owned car parks are managed to deliver the objectives of the LTP and development plan	Yes	It is stated that the parking policies are helping to deliver objectives in the Local Plan (Page 64). Outcomes such as reduced traffic flows seem to be being delivered. This along with a Variable Message signing system (Page 63) and an Urban Traffic Management Control system (Page 64) are estimated to save £3m over the next ten years in reduced congestion and reduced delays for

		passengers and motorists. The strategy is consistent with the objectives of the LTP as discussed on p12.
6. Implementation of strategies that do not encourage developers to seek out of town locations	No	Limited evidence. Page 64 gives details of two large central developments in CMK and briefly outlines the aims of the 2002 CMK Development Framework. It argues that that the strategies do not encourage developers to seek out of town locations because of the amount of new CMK development that has been delivered. But we have nothing to compare it with in regards to the development that is taking place outside CMK. This benchmark is not fully met.
<p><b>What other evidence not covered above do you consider demonstrates very strong delivery?</b></p> <p>None.</p>		

<b>Questions on assessment of strong delivery</b>	Number of Benchmarks for which strong delivery demonstrated: <b>4/6</b>	<b>No</b>
Has strong delivery been demonstrated by more than <u>two thirds</u> of the benchmarks (ie 5 or 6 out of 6) being evidenced sufficiently.		No
If no has strong delivery been demonstrated by <b>at least</b> half (ie 3 or more) of the benchmarks being evidenced strongly and there being substantial <u>additional evidence</u> demonstrating strong delivery overall.		No

## A5: Principal Road Maintenance Strategy and Bridge Strengthening Strategy

### Summary of Assessment:

The maintenance strategy has been marked as delivered but it has been difficult to demonstrate improvement to the condition of the highway network over the full LTP1 period. The core targets record no clear evidence for principal (and indeed non-principal) roads, and the different recording techniques used over the LTP period make it very difficult to compare like with like. The 2005/06 SCANNER results do however indicate that for principal roads the Council is meeting the DfT benchmark of 12% for good condition and the principal road SCANNER surveys show an improvement in condition between 2004/05 and 2005/06. More consistent recording methods should help monitoring in future years. With regard to bridge strengthening there are no weak carriageway elements of the Primary Road Network to strengthen so priority has been given to weak bridges on minor routes.

Minimum Requirements	Met?	Evidence and Comments
<p><b>Principal Road Maintenance</b></p> <p>1. A demonstrable improvement to the condition of the highway network over the LTP1 period</p>	Yes	<p>The core targets (see table at the end of the document) record no clear evidence for principal (and indeed non-principal roads.) Principal roads have been monitored using three different techniques over the plan period (Page 45) and it is very difficult to establish a trend as you are not comparing like with like. Based on SCANNER surveys, 22.88% of principal roads required structural maintenance in 2004/05, and only 9.99% in 2005/06. The 2005/06 SCANNER results also indicate that the Council is meeting the DfT benchmark of 12% of principal roads in good condition. So towards the end of the Plan period it can be seen that there is an improvement in condition. Given that and accepting the difficulties of comparing different monitoring techniques, this benchmark has been assessed as a 'Yes'.</p>
<p><b>Bridge Strengthening</b></p> <p>2. Evidence of significant reductions in structures related weight and width restrictions on the PRN network and the principal road network as a whole.</p>	Yes	<p>Page 67. No weak carriageway elements of PRN to strengthen (most of MK's bridges are under 40 years old), so priority was given to weak bridges on minor routes. Sandhill Barn Bridge was replaced, River Ouzel Bridge strengthened and Little Linford Lane Bridge received major scour repairs &amp; strengthening.</p>
<p><b>Are all the minimum requirements evidenced sufficiently? Yes</b></p>		

Benchmarks of Strong Delivery	Met?	Evidence and Comments
<p><b>Principal Road Maintenance</b></p> <p>1. A target for improved road condition achieved (or on track where and when survey methods amended)</p>	Yes	<p>MK's core target for unclassified roads is recorded as "achieved", but there is no clear evidence for principal and non-principal roads. Two local targets were set (Page 65): one was "achieved" and the other not. The latter (% age of reported incidents of dangerous damage made safe within 24 hours) achieved an impressive 96% success rate but the target was set at 98%. As some have been achieved, this benchmark is assessed as "Yes".</p>
<p>2. Evidence of significant outcomes for integrated transport, the environment and the economy delivered by maintenance schemes.</p>	Yes	<p>Page 66. A well maintained road network helps to reduce collisions and improves road safety. The Council aims to repair 98% of dangerously damaged roads within 24 hours. In 2005/06 the 'actual' figure was 96.1%.</p> <p>Page 47. STREETCARE is MK's mechanism of coordinating and integrating Council services to MK streets, resulting in better use of resources and less inconvenience for the public. A STREETCARE interactive website also enables residents to report on service or maintenance issues. It was a 'Highly Commended' finalist in the Best Community Initiative in the 2005 Association for Public Excellence Service Awards. Page 66 - a school-based STREETCARE scheme is aimed at encouraging students to respect their local environment. Long-term maintenance programmes are being developed in consultation with town and parish councils, who are encouraged to enhance the services beyond Council budgets. Page 18. An innovative street lighting scheme in Netherfield not only cuts crime and improves liveability, but is also energy efficient.</p>
<p>3. Evidence that environmental considerations are integrated into scheme design and implementation.</p>	Yes	<p>Page 66. Noise-reducing road surfaces are used almost exclusively throughout the MK network. The Council planes off recycled material for resurfacing and has piloted green recycled glass as a filler within a road base layer and removal of white lines with high-pressure water jets rather than burning off and causing excessive fumes in the environment.</p>
<p>4. Evidence that the programme has provided good value for money and has been delivered cost effectively.</p>	No	<p>Page 66. A proxy is given in the form of reduced insurance claims. A peak of 212 maintenance insurance claims in 2002/03 decreased to 121 in 2005/06. But no evidence on how for example, schemes are chosen in a cost effective manner. Certainly much funding has gone in (see Pages 48 &amp; 49) but there is little evidence about its cost effectiveness. STREETCARE seems the best example bringing together services so that delivery can be planned in a more coordinated way. There is little quantitative evidence though and this has been marked as a "No".</p>
<p><b>Bridge Strengthening</b></p> <p>5. Stretching targets or stretching progress achieved related to bridge strengthening and maintenance</p>	No	<p>None set.</p>
<p>6. Evidence that environmental considerations are integrated into the scheme design and implementation.</p>	Yes	<p>Page 68. A bat survey was undertaken as part of the H9 River Ouzel strengthening scheme. Concrete from the failed Kingston Bridge was sent for crushing and recycling.</p>
<p>7. Evidence that the programme has delivered significant outcomes for</p>	Yes	<p>Page 67, 68. Strengthening of Sandhill Barn and Little Linford Lane bridges on unclassified rural roads maintained links to rural communities that would otherwise have been faced with</p>

## ITEM 5 ANNEX B

integrated transport, the environment and the economy.		lengthy diversions. With British Rail Property Board's agreement, removal of a collapsed 100+ year old railway embankment at Hardmead improved visibility at the village entrance.
8. Evidence that the schemes implemented reflect wider transport priorities, have been influenced by stakeholder consultation and that there is a strong co-operative working with private bridge owners	No	Page 67. Only evidence found is that whilst Kingston Bridge was being replaced, the Council consulted organisers of the main access route to the annual 2-week Site Equipment Demonstration national construction plant exhibition, to recommend an alternative route. Would have expected information about general consultation procedures in this regard.

**What other evidence not covered above do you consider demonstrates very strong delivery?**

<b>Questions on assessment of strong delivery</b>	Number of Benchmarks for which strong delivery demonstrated: <b>5/8</b>	<b>No</b>
Has strong delivery been demonstrated by more than <u>two thirds</u> of the benchmarks (ie, 6 or more out of 8) being evidenced sufficiently.		No
If no has strong delivery been demonstrated by <b>at least</b> half (ie 4 or more) of the benchmarks being evidenced strongly and there being substantial <u>additional evidence</u> demonstrating strong delivery overall.		No



## SECTION B: OVERALL IMPACT OF LTP1 - KEY LINES OF ENQUIRY

The assessment classifies the evidence provided in the delivery report for each of the following five lines of inquiry as one of the following:

- Overall being consistent with the characteristics of excellent delivery (text in boxes in the column with that heading underlined);
- Overall being consistent with the characteristics of good delivery (text in boxes in the column with that heading underlined); and
- Overall demonstrating characteristics falling short of the characteristics of good delivery (no text is underlined).

For each of the key lines of enquiry reflect key evidence provided in the report and include it in the final column below.

General Questions (Lines of Enquiry)	Characteristics of Good Delivery	Characteristics of Excellent Delivery	Evidence Provided
<p>What difference has the first local transport plan made locally?</p>	<p><u>There are some of the following - substantial additional opportunities for bus travel over a substantial part of the plan area; substantially increased mode choices for journeys to work, school and town centres and substantial reductions in the impact of traffic on substantial numbers of local people (for example as residents or shoppers).</u></p>	<p>There has been a step change in travel choices or the quality of life, which is derived from the delivery of the local transport plan.</p>	<p>Good Delivery shown.</p> <p><u>Additional opportunities for bus travel</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Permanent P&amp;R scheme introduced between Central MK and the Coachway.</li> <li>2. Introduced 'Hanslope Harrier' linking Central MK with hospital. In a survey, 97% of users recommended the service to friends. (Table 7.1).</li> <li>3. Major scheme secured during the LTP1 period (Central Milton Keynes PT Access Improvements) this will likely increase bus service and reliability in LTP2.</li> <li>4. Bus use reported as up by 11% (p15)</li> </ol> <p><u>Increased Mode Choice</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Successful CarShare scheme with 2,700 members by end of plan period. (p63).</li> <li>6. Numbers of cycles parked in CMK increased by 29% over the life of the plan. (p15).</li> <li>7. 27 Travel Plans delivered (p61).</li> <li>8. Wyvern School Safer Routes Scheme delivered (p17).</li> </ol> <p><u>Reductions in impact of traffic</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Traffic Flows across the CMK cordon down by 7% between 2003-05. (p60).</li> </ol> <p><u>Quality of Life Improvement</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Quality of Life improvements in Newport Pagnell following LTP1 capital injection. (p15).</li> </ol>

<p>What are the key achievements of the first local transport plan?</p>	<p><u>There are some of the following that are attributable to the plan's implementation— investment in integrated packages of work with demonstrable and substantial benefits for the locality: travel is significantly safer and highways infrastructure is maintained to an improving or satisfactory standard.</u></p> <p><u>Also projects and programmes making substantial differences to the quality of life in parts of the plan area have been delivered effectively.</u></p>	<p>Investment in roads and public transport delivering measured and substantial improvements for the travelling public and other people affected by travel, accompanied by substantial improvements to safety, improved accessibility and highways infrastructure maintained to an improving or high standard.</p> <p>Major projects approved before or at the beginning of the plan period or packages of schemes have delivered major, monitored benefits.</p>	<p>Still issue of evidence on maintenance improvements but certainly good delivery shown.</p> <p><u>Safer Travel (p17)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduced KSIs by 35%, Child KSIs by 24%.</li> <li>2. Implemented 31 safer routes to schools schemes, including Redway improvements.</li> <li>3. Vehicle crime down from 31 crimes per 1000 of the population to 17.</li> <li>4. A new cycle safe initiative including secure cycle parking, showers and changing facilities contributed towards a 30% increase in cycle parking at Central MK Rail Station.</li> </ol> <p><u>Improved maintenance</u></p> <p>5. Although clear evidence is hard to substantiate it is clear (p46/47), that in 2005/06 SCANNER results indicate that the Council is meeting the DfT benchmark of 12% of principal roads in good condition. Unclassified roads also met the DfT benchmark. (Non Principal roads did not hit the benchmark). In addition 96% of dangerously damaged roads are made safe within 24 hours.</p> <p>6. A new STREETCARE interactive website enables residents access information about maintenance issues, (and was a 'Highly Commended' finalist in the Best Community Initiative in the 2005 Association for Public Excellence Service Awards).</p> <p><u>Accessibility (p18)</u></p>

## ITEM 5 ANNEX B

			<p>7. 77% of rural households are within 800m of an hourly or better bus service.              8. The new Hanslope Harrier demand-responsive bus service gained a 97% recommendation rating.              9. Bus use up by 11%.              10. 30% increase in cycle parking at Central MK Rail Station.</p> <p><u>Improved Quality of Life (p17)</u>              For example Improved air quality.              11. Their 3 air quality targets (for nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter and carbon monoxide) all achieved their targets.              12. Weekly savings in commuting distances increased from 25,000kms to 43,000kms.              13. Weekly reductions in carbon dioxide increased from 4,500kg to 7,300kg.              14 Weekly reductions in oxides of nitrogen increased from 20kg to 40kg.              15. Weekly savings in fuel increased from 1,850 litres to 3,200 litres.</p>
<p>Have the key aims and objectives of the plan been achieved?</p> <p>(This should consider if the key aims and objectives have changed since the original plan's publication, how and why they have)</p>	<p><u>More of the key aims and objectives have been fully or largely achieved, than not achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Where key aims and objectives are not achieved, there is evidence that remedial action has been or is being taken, or that the importance of the aims and objectives has been reviewed with action then taken.</u></p>	<p>All or most of the key aims and objectives of the original plan have been achieved.</p> <p>There are strong and well-justified reasons why any key aims and objectives of the original plan have not been achieved or strong remedial action is being taken.</p> <p>The strategy set out in the first plan has been largely implemented, exceeded or replaced with an even better strategy that has been delivered.</p>	<p>Progress towards Plan objectives are set out on p24, these are linked to the “shared objectives” – and seem to be tweaked somewhat from those described on p12.</p> <p>Some of the evidence is more robust than others linking for example back to achieved targets (eg KSI and bus patronage figures). But certainly there has been “progress” towards achieving all plan objectives listed.</p> <p>Progress has been made towards the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encouraging sustainable travel</li> <li>• improving air quality</li> <li>• improving road safety</li> <li>• enhancing economic prosperity &amp; supporting regeneration</li> <li>• ensuring all people are able to move</li> </ul>

## ITEM 5 ANNEX B

			<p>around safely and conveniently</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improving interchange between modes</li> <li>• integrating land use planning with transport and other policy areas</li> <li>• improving the safety and health of schoolchildren.</li> </ul>
<p>What has worked well and might be repeated and what might be done differently in hindsight?</p>	<p><u>The delivery of the plan has been associated with projects and policies that have worked well and whose positive impact has been demonstrated.</u></p> <p><u>There is evidence that delivery has been refined during the plan period to improve effectiveness.</u></p>	<p>Key policies and programmes have been successful.</p> <p>There is strong evidence of a commitment to continuous improvement and learning from what has not worked particularly well.</p>	<p>What has worked well:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Good delivery against core targets.</li> <li>2. Development of partnerships. Audit Commission acknowledged that the Council “uses imaginative partnership working to build capacity” (p29).</li> </ol> <p>There is ample evidence that delivery has been refined during the plan (p25-26). Examples include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Factoring public transport into Transport model.</li> <li>2. Establish mechanisms to deliver partnership schemes.</li> <li>3. Improving performance management monitoring.</li> <li>4. Make local targets challenging AND achievable.</li> <li>5. Ensure community and regional organisations are fully engaged and informed of the transport implications of growth.</li> <li>6. Put stronger focus on travel planning.</li> <li>7. Integrate land use planning &amp; sustainable transport.</li> </ol> <p>Evidence that this refinement is progressing into LTP2 eg quarterly monitoring of a key basket of indicators (including ‘improving public transport’) will be a key element of LTP2; and there will be a</p>

			<p>more robust approach to targets overall in LTP2 (p25).</p>
<p>What foundations for the longer term have been put in place during the first local transport plan period, in particular related to the shared central/ local priorities?</p>	<p>There have been significant strides during the first plan period, for example related to the importance of road safety, the role of local public transport and the need to manage road space and parking stock effectively as part of an integrated transport policy.</p>	<p><u>There is evidence of strong and wide partnership working, particularly to contribute to making smarter travel choices and to managing the demand for car travel where it is or will cause major congestion and pollution problems.</u></p> <p><u>Substantial good quality infrastructure for a variety of modes has been put in place.</u></p>	<p><u>Good delivery in the first plan period of</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road Safety : KSIs down by 39% and Child KSI by 46%.</li> <li>• Public Transport : Patronage up by 11%</li> <li>• Parking charges introduced – number of charged spaces doubled to 57%.</li> </ul> <p><u>Strong evidence of longer term planning</u> Pp 26 – 33.</p> <p>MK as a growth area dominates the forward planning and the Report states that “the vision cannot be realised without great expansion and improvement in bus services and the implementation of appropriate measures to manage demand for transport” (p27).</p> <p>Evidence of strong partnership eg the Joint Transport Delivery Team (p29) – is designed to ensure that transport related infrastructure schemes to support growth are effectively delivered.</p> <p>Foundations for the future include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Long term planning</u>, eg. MK PT Long Term Vision; MKP Transport Delivery Plan 2006-2011; Longer Term Growth Plan to 2016; Sustainable Communities Plan (development of Central Rail Station, M1 J14 improvements, PT infrastructure improvements).</li> <li>2. <u>Partnerships</u>: eg Joint Transport Delivery Team; Transport Partnership; MK Partnership Committee, &amp; English Partnerships.</li> </ol>

**ITEM 5 ANNEX B**

			3. Investing in existing assets: Redways (for cyclists and pedestrians); quality bus routes and improved street lighting.
--	--	--	---