

Date Rec'd	Target Response (15 working days)	Question by:	Response from:	Response Received	Published
21/10/2015	11/11/2015	<p>Cllr D Hopkins</p> <p>We are potentially on the cusp of the next phase of Milton Keynes growth with the MK Borough Site Allocations Plan and Plan:MK either out, or about to go out for consultation, over 1300 new dwellings in the former to catch up on our housing figures and potentially tens of thousands more under Plan:MK.</p> <p>However, the greatest challenge to any further expansion is the capacity of the road systems in the rural hinterland of the Borough to be able to deal with these ever increasing levels of traffic now – today!</p> <p>I recently sought assurance via a recent question to Cabinet that this issue was being taken seriously, but found no such assurance. So I ask, will the leader or his appointed Cabinet member join with me on a site visit to Wavendon, Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill to witness first-hand the road traffic management challenges facing us today before committing to any additional numbers in the level of housing and employment sites?</p>	<p>Cllr P Marland</p> <p>Plan:MK needs to show that all possible options for future development have been considered and that good reasons for rejecting these are founded with robust and up to date evidence. Part of that evidence will include, amongst other things, the capacity of the road and transport network.</p> <p>The evidence can be augmented by site inspections and I would be happy for my Cabinet colleague to visit the locations proposed when the information about the road capacity or lack of capacity has been provided. If it is considered necessary to inspect on site now, again I am content for this to be arranged.</p>	06/11/2015	06/11/2015

Date Rec'd	Target Response (15 working days)	Question by:	Response from:	Response Received	Published
21/10/2015	11/11/2015	<p>Cllr D Hopkins</p> <p>I would like to add my congratulations and thanks to the officers of this council and to our partners in the emergency services, transport services etc. and of course to the very many volunteers for their part in making the Rugby World Cup in MK the success it undoubtedly has been.</p> <p>However I would temper that with one observation regarding the planning undertaken by London Midland and the use of the Bedford to Bletchley rail link on the day of the Japan –v Samoa fixture.</p> <p>As Fenny Stratford is in fact the nearest station to Stadium MK one would have reasonably imagined its use as a rail hub for fans visiting MK from Bedford and beyond would have been identified as a key consideration. Let me tell you what actually happened.</p> <p>Bedford is a Rugby town – is a direct link to other Rugby cities such as Leicester. The trains departing from Bedford arriving at Fenny before the game left Bedford crammed. So much so that no one was permitted to board the trains at any of the halts along the route. At Woburn Sands the platform was full of over 70 fans waiting to catch the 1.26pm train. No one could board the train leaving my residents having to make last minute arrangements to get to Stadium MK by whatever other option they could find. Deeply disappointing.</p>	<p>Cllr P Marland</p> <p>I thank David for his kind comments and I agree that situation he has described is both unacceptable and in stark contrast to the other transport, parking and traffic management arrangements that were made for the games hosted in Milton-Keynes which was a major success. I will write to London-Midland copying my letter to England Rugby for information.</p>	06/11/2015	06/11/2015

Date Rec'd	Target Response (15 working days)	Question by:	Response from:	Response Received	Published
		<p>Will the responsible Cabinet member write to London Midland to express our concerns over this lack of planning and ensure that officers work with the franchise holder in connection with any future International, European or Premiership Rugby fixtures to ensure that this important transport hub is included in the planning?</p>			
22/10/2015	12/11/2015	<p>Cllr V McPake</p> <p>Do you agree that in light of the £1.8 mi overspend, in addition to the £1m set aside for any overspend, and the lengthy over-run time wise that was not notified to ward members, that this matter must go to Audit for full investigation?</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member tell me which transport projects have been either delayed, or worse ditched, due to this overspend; plus the impact on such projects like Smarter Choices and when will members and relevant transport groups be made aware of the implications?</p>	<p>Cllr R Middleton/Cllr M Clifton</p> <p>We should recognise that the A421 scheme has provided much needed additional capacity on the approached to the Kingston roundabout. This will ensure economic benefits in years to come. It is also a fact that bidding for such a large scheme is notoriously difficult given the short bidding timescale provided by Government. However, the overspend is a concern and has already been passed to Internal Audit for investigation.</p> <p>There is a potential overspend on the current A421 scheme. The final cost of the scheme is estimated in the region of £1.68m, however this will not be finalised until later in the year once the contractor has settled contracts with their subcontractors. However, we must fund this overspend and we have no spare capital resources in the current year, so the only option is to reduce schemes from elsewhere in the programme. So the following items were identified as part of funding the overspend:</p>		

Date Rec'd	Target Response (15 working days)	Question by:	Response from:	Response Received	Published
			<p>The £843k for Smarter Choices was funding allocated at a high level within the capital programme, this relates to unspent funding in the programme over the last few years. Spend Approval had not yet been requested to identify exactly what the breakdown of the funds would be, however, broadly this had been planned to be spent on new cycle links on redways, a direct redway link on Silbury boulevard, and cmk wayfinding. Spend approval had not been requested as we were not ready to deliver the schemes at this time. Alternative ways are being sought to fund the schemes through either S106 or from the 2016/17 capital allocations (£446k is available).</p> <p>Various amounts totalling £50k have been taken across traffic management, as a new project manager has been appointed and has reviewed the likely allocation of costs, indicating schemes are likely to be delivered at a lower cost.</p>		