

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

Consultation Report

September 2022



Contents

- 1. Introduction3
- 2. Consultation Process4
 - 2.1. Consultation Method4
 - 2.2. The Consultation Questionnaire.....4
- 3. Consultation Findings5
 - 3.1. The Questionnaire results5
 - 3.2. Summary of area specific responses11
 - 3.3. Additional issues raised during the consultation16
- 4. Peer Review18
- 5. Summary and Recommendations19
 - 5.1 Recommendations for amendments to the Draft LCWIP20
- Annex A – The Consultation Questionnairei

1. Introduction

Following the adoption of a new active travel strategy as part of the *Road Safety, Walking & Cycling and Smarter Travel Strategy*, Milton Keynes City Council has developed a strategic active travel infrastructure plan – *Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)*. The LCWIP aims to provide a strategic plan for active travel infrastructure development throughout Milton Keynes. In line with LCWIP guidance from the Department for Transport (DfT), it will support Milton Keynes City Council in creating better places to live and work, including:

- **Places designed for people:** Places that have cycling and walking at their heart, where cycling and walking offer a safe and reliable way to travel for short journeys
- **Healthy places:** The development of a wider green network of paths, routes and open spaces
- **Better mobility:** Engagement with citizens to encourage uptake of cycling and walking, making it easy, normal and enjoyable.

Close to a hundred schemes have been put forward from local stakeholders and reviewed as part of all of the identified schemes. The schemes have been reviewed, evaluated and scored against a bespoke appraisal metric, designed with the support of key stakeholders, such as Cycle Forum members.

This resulted in this LCWIP producing an ambitious plan for the expansion and upgrade of the existing Redway network, to encourage higher usage by the public. As part of this plan, wider recommendations were made on other supporting infrastructure, such as signage and lighting, although this does not include maintenance issues such as vegetation management or potholes.

2. Consultation Process

2.1. Consultation Method

The twelve-week consultation period for the Draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan for Milton Keynes ran from 17th January 2022 until 13th March 2022. During this period, the LCWIP documents could be viewed via links on the council's website, which also housed a self-completion questionnaire to capture feedback on the Plan. Eighty-three questionnaire responses were received.

Respondents could also email, telephone or write to the council's Transport Policy team; an approach taken by stakeholders, such as parish and ward councillors, local politicians and cycling groups. Seven detailed written responses were received by Milton Keynes' Transport Policy team, meaning a total of ninety responses were received. All correspondence was logged and a response prepared, which can be found [here](#).

2.2. The Consultation Questionnaire

A self-completion questionnaire was devised to capture views on this LCWIP and was housed alongside the supporting LCWIP documents. Please see Annex A for the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to receive feedback on whether the draft LCWIP provided a clear strategy for future investment, if respondents agreed with the appraisal method and the results of the appraised long list. Comments were also welcome on the LCWIP overall and any individual concerns. Chapter 3 provides a breakdown of the responses received.

3. Consultation Findings

3.1. The Questionnaire results

The questionnaire had multiple questions to respond to. Respondents could reply “Yes”, “Neutral” or “No” to questions 2, 4 and 6. Question 3, 5 and 7 asked for reasons why the respondent answered in the previous question. The breakdown of these responses can be found in Sections 3.2 to Section 3.4. Question 8 asked for feedback on any specific schemes, responses are summarised in Section 3.5. Question 9 asked for feedback on the LCWIP as a document; these responses are summarised in Section 3.6.

Responses to Q2 and Q3




Figure 1 - Responses to Q2

Question 2 asks respondents if they thought Milton Keynes’ draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan provided a clear strategy for the future investment in active travel infrastructure.

- 58% said “Yes” that the draft LCWIP provides a clear strategy for the future investment in active travel infrastructure, 24% were “Neutral” and 18% responded “No”.

- **Question 3** asks respondents: *Any further comments on Question 2?* This allows for partially discovering why respondents responded as they did.
- For 27% of “No” responses, the design of new Redway infrastructure, especially in new development areas, was raised as an issue. Concern was raised over how current and future Redways fail to capitalise on direct routes, thus providing great cycling for exercise routes but not encouraging the use of sustainable transport modes for trips to the shops or to work.
- Similarly, 27% cited the Redway infrastructure in a certain area was not prioritised highly enough. Concern over the deliverability of proposed schemes in Stony Stratford was raised. The lack of Redway connection out of Eaton Leys and lack of provision of Redways in rural Milton Keynes were raised as issues. The new *Redway Design Manual* and the Super Routes Project seek to improve direct links in the borough, capitalising on recommendations made in this full LCWIP report. Rural areas were covered in the interborough network of schemes, which was designed for improving direct, long-distance Redway connections in the borough.
- 7% of the “No” responders stated that the use of eScooters was an issue because they were deemed a menace when being ridden and an obstacle when left dumped in the middle of the walkway. This links to 7% of responders stating that there needs to be more emphasis on the prioritisation of those who cycle over the use of car. The new *Redway Design Manual* will look to address these issues by suggesting a new Redway design, which follows national design guidance featured in *LTN 1/20* and *Manual for Streets*, which advocates for segregation of pedestrians and cyclists and increased prioritisation of those who use active modes of travel.




Figure 2 – Q3 - Why Responders responded “No”

- 13% of “No” responders stated that better lighting, CCTV and maintenance of the existing Redway infrastructure needed to be addressed to improve the safety of the Redways. In addition, 9% of “Neutral” responses raised maintenance and why it was deemed out of scope of the LCWIP as the reason for the response. This LCWIP recommends a maintenance strategy is adopted but addressing specific maintenance issues were out of scope of this LCWIP because this LCWIP focuses on the delivery of new infrastructure.
- None of the neutral responses directly answered Q3, with 50% giving no reason for responding “Neutral”.
- 18% of “Neutral” responders stated they were unable to read all the LCWIP documents, suggesting that the documents may need to be edited so that they are more accessible.




Figure 3 - Q3 - Why Respondents responded "Neutral"

Responses to Q4 and Q5




Figure 4 - Responses to Q4

- **Question 4** asked respondents if they agree with the appraisal metric that has been developed to prioritise all schemes that have been put forward.
- 45% said they agreed with the appraisal metric, 38% were “Neutral” and 16% responded “No”.
- **Question 5** asks: *Any further comments on Question 4?*
- Of the responses that were “No”, a variety of reasons were given in Question 5, however, only 23% of responses addressed the appraisal method, particularly the prioritisation of schemes in a certain area.
- These 23% responded “No” because of schemes appraised in Olney and Hanslope. The respondents believed that the appraisal metric and prioritisation method scored these schemes lowly because they were in rural areas. Believing the method was biased towards urban areas. The LCWIP includes a mix of scheme types in a wide range of areas. However, it is accepted that from a consideration of likely usage, proximity to key destinations, areas of deprivation and delivery of a cohesive network schemes, urban schemes tended to be rank higher.
- Of the other reasons responding “No”, the most common reason was unhappiness that the maintenance of the existing Redway network was out of scope of LCWIP (23%). This LCWIP recognises the importance of maintenance and recommends a maintenance strategy is adopted but addressing specific maintenance issues were out of scope because this LCWIP focuses on the delivery of new infrastructure.
- The segregation of the different Redway users and the potential design of schemes in specific areas, especially in new development areas were also reason given for responding “No”.
- 8% of “No” responses stated the limitations of using Strava as a data source was the reason. Additionally, 10% of “Neutral” responses were due to the use of Strava data. It is acknowledged that Strava dataset does have certain weaknesses, but providing it is used in combination with other data sources, it contributes to a robust evidence base overall.




Figure 5 – Q5 - Why Responders Responded "No"



Figure 6 - Q5 - Why Responders responded "Neutral"

- 78% of responders gave no reason for why they responded “Neutral”, with no reasons given for disagreement with the appraisal method and no pattern emerging from the remaining responses.
- One respondent, 3%, responded “Neutral” asking the question if Milton Keynes City Council is looking to replicate surrounding council’s policies of making it more difficult for dog walkers to use long leads or have their dogs off lead. The Highway Code and our established *Redway Code of Conduct* already encourages dogs to be on short lead on paths shared with cyclists.

Responses to Q6 and Q7




Figure 7 - Responses to Q6

- **Question 6** ask respondents if they agree with the results of the *Long List Appraisal* (looking at the top scoring schemes and the full list).
- 36% of responders agreed with the results of the long list appraisal, 34% were “Neutral” and 30% responded “No”.

- Of the respondents that responded “No”, 48% disagreed with the Long List Appraisal because they believed a certain location or area was not scored as highly as they felt it should. These areas were in rural locations, where they believed there was a bias towards urban areas, illustrated by only two rural schemes being in the top fifty scoring schemes. This LCWIP includes a mix of scheme types in a wide range of areas. The prioritisation of schemes considered likely usage, proximity to key destinations, areas of deprivation and delivery of a cohesive network schemes, where urban schemes tended to be rank higher.



Figure 8 – Q7 - Why Responders Responded "No"

- Of the respondents that responded “No”, 29% did not give a reason for why they responded as they did.
- 14% of those who responded “No”, stated it was because the appraisal metric did not provide enough weight to a certain metric, such as safety or the consideration of the impact new developments have on active travel infrastructure. The appraisal metric considered a wide range of factors and was designed to be fair, with the different criteria weighted to ensure that there were no biases towards certain schemes. Stakeholder engagement during the LCWIP development guided the appraisal metric and their weighting. The potential to improve road safety was a medium priority and contributed 6% of any given score. The supporting of future developments was a high priority and contributed 8% of any given score.

- Of the respondents that responded “Neutral”, 69% did not give a reason. In the future, it is recommended that a selection of options are provided on the questionnaire, with a box for other reasons.
- 14% responded “Neutral” because they wished to highlight an issue over the prioritisation of schemes in a certain location.
- 10% responded “Neutral” because they had not seen the *Long List Appraisal*, suggesting that there may have been an issue with access to the document and/or its presentation.




Figure 9 – Q7 - Why Responders Responded "Neutral"

3.2. Summary of area specific responses

Analysis and feedback on schemes were extremely valuable and greatly appreciated during the consultation exercise. It will be considered when detailed designs, including changes to existing Redways, are in active development and against the latest national guidance and the *Redway Design Manual*. Areas where responses highlighted concern are shown in *Figure 10*.




Figure 10 - Areas Raised in Consultation exercise

The areas raised the most were Hanslope, Stony Stratford, Broughton/Kingston and Eaton Leys, with the lack of provision and the potential design of schemes the main points of concern. Concerns were also raised over the infrastructure plans for the new developments.

Hanslope

Active travel infrastructure and the prioritisation of schemes was raised as an issue for Hanslope. Eight responses expressed how they did not believe enough focus was given to the area to meet the demand produced by the new housing developments. All schemes have been appraised using a bespoke method which takes account of a range of criteria, not just housing/population growth. Please refer to *Appendix D (Milton Keynes Scheme Appraisal Technical Note, p. 2)* for more information.

Furthermore, an alternative to Scheme 16 was raised; using a Sustrans route, new infrastructure would create an off-road Redway along Bullington End Road to connect with Hanslope Park and then along to Park Road to Hanslope. In addition, a respondent recommends that a new scheme connecting the Hanslope primary school to the new estates and Hanslope Park be added to the long list.

Stony Stratford

The proposed schemes for Stony Stratford were overall met with praise. Respondents were happy that infrastructure has been proposed in this area, however, recognise the difficulty in the area, especially schemes 74, 75, 244 and 137. The feedback on the schemes is greatly appreciated and will be considered when schemes are in active development.

Broughton/Kingston

A respondent highlighted the linkage problem between Kingston Roundabout and Broughton areas. The industrial area of Magna Park provides for many local jobs, but the respondent states it is only accessible by dangerous informal pathways. Between Newport Road and Standing Way, the Redway diverts to Kingston, leaving people to walk underneath a bridge for Broughton Brook which is always flowing. The road is narrowed without pedestrian or cycling access. Scheme 58 looks to improve the existing Redway between Kingston and Broughton. As part of this upgrade, a more direct route will be provided to improve the existing Redway network. The scheme is medium term and scored highly. In addition, Schemes 32 and 38 will be extended to increase Redway connectivity along Broughton Brook.

Eaton Leys

Four comments were received over the lack of Redway connectivity between Eaton Leys and the rest of the city. It was highlighted that there is currently no safe way off the estate, unless you have a car, with people walking along a grass verge to access facilities adjacent to Kelly's

Kitchen roundabout and in Fenny Stratford. There is a bridge for those who want to walk and cycle being installed to connect Eaton Leys to the existing footpath network around Saffron Gardens and Waterhall Park, with plans well advanced. Eaton Leys was designed to be an 1800 home new settlement, however, 1200 of those homes, and a lot of social infrastructure, is on the Buckinghamshire side of the border, which is yet to obtain planning consent. A missing link along the A4146 will be added to the long list and prioritised accordingly.

Central Milton Keynes

LCWIP proposes several new routes in CMK to improve connectivity, such as scheme 113, 132 and 115. Scheme 113 has been brought forward for further development (feasibility study). Other proposed schemes in Central Milton Keynes were also praised. Schemes 132, 113 and 124 look to improve East-West connections and were strongly supported, with the proposed route potentially helping to overcome psychological and physical barriers to cycling around the city centre.

Pentewan

Gate

Praise was given to Scheme 125, which looks to increase the safety of pedestrians at a bell-mouth junction at the entrance into Fishermead, which is typical of a number of junctions along the grid road network. An additional dangerous bell-mouth junction was identified, Snowden Drive, which will be noted as a new scheme. It is acknowledged that bell-mouth junctions are designed for the ease of car use, often at the expense of those who walk and cycle. All new schemes will be designed in line with *LTN1/20* and the new *Redway Design Manual* to ensure safety of all road users.

Glebe Farm

A respondent highlighted issues with the design and the implementation of the new infrastructure from the Glebe Farm area out to the path parallel to the A421 heading towards M1 J13, which is very busy and not properly integrated. It was highlighted that the Salford-Woburn Sands crossing required additional thought, because the road traffic sightlines are poor and traffic speeds quite high. Ideally, a light-controlled crossing, like the ones near the Wavendon Arms, would be installed. There are four schemes identified in the LCWIP that propose to improve the connectivity and links between Glebe Farm and the surrounding areas, and these concerns will be considered when these plans are developed further.

Fairfields

Respondents raised issues with the Redway connectivity of Fairfields to Stony Stratford. Although not directly addressed, Scheme 52 looks to create new Redway infrastructure along Watling Street, which would create a link for Fairfields.

Bletchley

Respondents highlighted that it's difficult to currently cycle in Bletchley, due to the lack of infrastructure in the old town. Fifty schemes have been proposed in Bletchley to improve connectivity. The majority of these schemes scored highly, with the top priority schemes being taken forward for further design work. There was praise for the proposed schemes. Scheme 14, along Buckingham Road, received particular praise. One respondent was happy to read that more cycle infrastructure is proposed as the road has had increased vehicular traffic in recent years, making cycling on the road more challenging.

Newport Pagnell

Concern was raised over the provision of schemes in Newport Pagnell and engagement with local plans for cycle routes in the new Tickford Fields Farm development areas. The routes suggestions for Newport Pagnell were taken from the Neighbourhood Plan, with further detailed route selection process to follow. Whilst acknowledged in LCWIP, Tickford Fields Farm active travel links are being looked at separately as part of the planning consent for this development. In addition, a request for a new scheme in Newport Pagnell was received. The creation of a new bridge over the River Ouzel would add fluidity to the various sections of the town and increase access to green spaces to enjoy. This extra link will be considered when Scheme 230 is in active development, subject to funding availability.

Woburn Sands

A respondent raised issue over Woburn Sands not being included as a centre of interest during the work to establish the geographical scope of the project. It is acknowledged that Woburn Sands is an important core centre of activity in Milton Keynes, however, it was not part of the geographical scoping exercise. Although Woburn Sands was not included, infrastructure improvements have been captured throughout the different stages of the development of the long list. Please see Section 1.6 of Annex B – Full long-list maps for proposed schemes in Woburn Sands.

Olney and Emberton Park

Two respondents highlighted that the access to Olney from Emberton Park is dangerous and a missing link. The Redway that is at the south of Olney suddenly stops, leaving Redway users to merge with traffic on a busy, high-speed road. Scheme 246 looks to improve the existing Redway access to Olney High Street. Engagement with stakeholders will be undertaken in the design stage, once external funding is secured. Once in the design stage, the entire route will be reviewed and upgraded to Redway standard, ensuring it is suitable for pedestrian and cyclist use, whilst being well connected to the rest of the network.

Olney and Lavendon

One respondent requested the change in prioritisation of the Redway connecting Lavendon to Olney, which is currently classed as long-term, but was also classed as long-term in 2012. All schemes have been appraised using a bespoke method, please refer to Appendix D (*Milton Keynes Scheme Appraisal Technical Note*, p. 2) for more information. There is insufficient justification to revise the LCWIP prioritisation of this scheme.

Tow and canal paths

Cycle paths next to canals and the Railway Walk existing infrastructure were mentioned as being of poor quality. Throughout the development process of LCWIP, it has been established that tow paths and leisure routes form part of the overall active travel network. However, these routes are managed by the Parks Trust and the Canal Trust. This means that partnership working will be required to deliver any improvements to this infrastructure and any upgrades would require the input of the Canal Trust.

Connecting to outside Milton Keynes

Cycle routes that connect Milton Keynes with Towcester, Buckingham, Leighton Buzzard, Cranfield and Glebe Farm/Woburn Sands to Ridgmont Station were raised as links that should be considered. Schemes 138 and 137 provide a link to Buckingham; Scheme 54 to Cranfield; and Scheme 6 to Leighton Buzzard. A link to Towcester would almost entirely be within Western Northamptonshire, so the merits of this would need to be considered by this local authority, similarly for links to Ridgmont Station. Milton Keynes City Council would happily work with neighbouring authorities and any third parties to facilitate these schemes moving forward.

New development areas

Numerous respondents raised concerns over the Redway provisions in the new development areas (MK East, MK West and the Eastern Expansion Area). The planned new infrastructure can be found in the Master Plan SPDs for each of these areas. When these settlements are built, new schemes can be added to the long list if missing links are identified.

3.3. Additional issues raised during the consultation

The LCWIP not addressing the lack of maintenance and landscaping on the existing Redway infrastructure was raised by almost a quarter of respondents. It was highlighted that not cutting back verges and vegetation, litter picking and low branches narrowing the Redways, endanger users and puncture tires. The LCWIP proposes schemes for improving the connectivity of the existing network by suggesting new infrastructure to fix missing links or create new active travel routes. The LCWIP recognises the importance of maintenance of the existing infrastructure and its role in encouraging active travel amongst the residents of Milton Keynes and this LCWIP does advise the consistent upkeep of the Redways (see Section 5.5.6 of the Full Report).

There were responses that questioned the design of the Redways, specifically over safety and security, especially for older users and at underpasses, where CCTV was requested. The future *Redway Design Manual* will provide a standard for the future design of the Redways in Milton Keynes, ensuring they are compatible with *LTN 1/20, Manual for Streets* and do not include unnecessary street clutter that makes it more difficult to use other forms of transport, such as eCargo bikes and mobility scooters.

Safety and speed restrictions concerns were also raised. Respondents wanted the LCWIP to recommend a default 20mph speed limit in residential areas, shopping areas, High Streets and near schools. Speed reductions are favoured by the latest *Road Safety, Walking and Cycling, and Smarter Travel Strategy*. All future schemes are to be designed in line with *LTN1/20* that requires cycle routes to be fast direct and coherent (including crossing point). All future designs are required to comply with *LTN 1/20* safety requirements. One of the key principles is to give active travel users priority over cars and without reducing speed limits in some location it will not be possible to achieve. Detailed Redway design guidance, including recommendations for infrastructure solutions at conflict points between those who cycle and motorists, will be available in the new *Redway Design Manual*. This LCWIP also recommends low traffic neighbourhoods in different areas, which will be considered in the design stages of schemes that may benefit from them.

Despite receiving responses praising the high quality and easiness to read the LCWIP, there were more responses stating that the documents were difficult to read, to access, not user friendly and too technical. It is recommended that the LCWIP documents are reviewed and made more accessible for those who want to read them.

One response asks for an audit to determine the various barriers and obstacles that have been installed on the Redways over the years. The new *Redway Design Manual* is being updated to reflect *LTN 1/20* and the need to take more care with the application of any barriers or bollards on the network. This will inform the future improvements to the existing network to improve accessibility and ease of use.

Prioritisation of pedestrian, cyclist and public transport over automobile traffic in both investment and ease of use was raised. All future schemes that require funding from DfT must be designed in line with *LTN 1/20*, which requires schemes to prioritise pedestrian and cycle movement over cars, otherwise they are not going to be funded. All towns in Milton Keynes with no cycle infrastructure are likely to require some road space re-allocation to facilitate segregation of active travel. Opportunities will be taken to give Redway users priority over traffic where safe to do so.

A question was asked over why the LCWIP does not support the continued building of underpasses, as it is believed that they provide the only safe way to cross major roads. There is sufficient amount of evidence provided in the latest strategy papers (*Road Safety, Walking & Cycling, and Smarter Travel Strategy* and LCWIP papers) to show that underpasses are often perceived to attract anti-social behaviour and being unsafe. However, the new *Redway Design Manual* will include updated guidance on their application and design.

Cycle parking and maintenance points were raised. Whilst schemes are ongoing to improve the quantity and quality of provision of cycle parking in Milton Keynes, they are outside of the scope of LCWIP. Separate to this LCWIP, the idea of creating bicycle maintenance points will be explored in other schemes to encourage active travel.

4. Peer Review

The work produced by City Science in developing this LCWIP was reviewed by Cycling UK, the Department for Transport funded and appointed technical expert. The main objective of this peer review was to ensure that the plan captured the different infrastructure and unique challenges of Milton Keynes, ensuring this LCWIP meets national standards and DfT requirements. Overall, the peer review confirmed that Milton Keynes' LCWIP is a well-designed document with strong technical evidence that is fit for purpose.

Cycling UK recommended the inclusion of a governance section in the main document and suggestions were made for the proposed governance structure. A governance section has been added, with reference to stakeholder input, to guide the delivery of this LCWIP. Further information can be found in Section 7.1 of the main document.

In addition, due to the quantity of schemes suggested, Cycling UK suggested including a clear programme for scheme delivery which can take advantage of various funding opportunities. A clearer delivery plan has been developed and added to Chapter 7 of the main report.

Although stakeholder input was present throughout the LCWIP process and had useful inputs, Cycling UK would have liked to have seen more widespread stakeholder engagement at the beginning of the process, in particular, from people with disabilities, drivers, public transport users and other groups or individuals who may have wanted to take part. When designs for schemes identified in this LCWIP are being advanced, further stakeholder engagement will be undertaken and increased effort will be made to broaden engagement.

In terms of design of the proposed schemes, greater emphasis on segregation, especially with reference to the Super Route network, was requested. Section 5.7.1 highlights that work is being undertaken to integrate Redway designs with LTN 1/20 guidance, with specific recommendations for segregated infrastructure. In reference to LTN 1/20, Cycling UK suggested removing repeating sections of the topic and make a policy commitment for new infrastructure to be built to this standard. Sections on LTN 1/20 have been simplified and more detailed integration of policy and clarity of required standards will be included in the new *Redway Design Manual*.

Cycle UK were especially happy to see the inclusion of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in this LCWIP, with a clear, logical process identified. MKCC will seek to explore the introduction of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, where suitable and with stakeholder support.

5. Summary and Recommendations

Overall, the majority of respondents were supportive of the ambitions shown in the LCWIP, believing the plan would help increase the uptake of cycling and walking in the city.

One of the overall themes that emerged from the LCWIP consultation exercise was unhappiness with the maintenance, including landscaping and waste clearance, of the existing Redway network being out of scope of the LCWIP.

That there are only two rural schemes in the top fifty highlighted respondents' issues with the appraisal method, with respondents believing there is a bias against rural schemes. Rural areas, such as Hanslope, Castlethorpe and Olney to Emberton, were deemed to not have scored as highly as they should, with requests for certain schemes to have their scores adjusted. The size of the long list makes it clear that there is very large and costly potential programme of active travel improvements required. Coupled with the maintenance and upgrades needed to the existing Redway network, there is a large resource requirement, which the council cannot possibly service. Prioritisation is essential and the LCWIP will guide what the council chooses to spend scarce resources on. The higher priority schemes are in urban areas, as these are the schemes that will generate the most use and serve the most destinations and areas of deprivation.

It emerged that a proportion of respondents found it difficult to access and/or read the LCWIP documents. The format of the LCWIP needs updating to make it more accessible for readers, with the:

- Final version of LCWIP to have the structure updated so the document is easier to follow
- A delivery plan to be included for the selected top priority schemes

LCWIPs are required to secure future funding from the Department for Transport and the guidance encourages these plans to be ambitious. Local authorities are encouraged to review LCWIPs regularly. As such, Milton Keynes City Council's Transport Planning Team will keep a log of new scheme suggestions that were not covered in the original LCWIP process. The team will be able to appraise these schemes and update our priority list. Even if these schemes score low and the team do not actively develop plans for them, by being on the long list, they become a reference for Planning and Highways Development Control to identify a potential need for the scheme, which could then come forward with new development plans or S106 monies. In the meantime, we will continue to develop a smaller set of schemes to maintain a delivery plan for the next few years.

From this questionnaire, it became apparent that there needed to be more options for responders to express their answers to the questions. There was a common trend of responders selecting "Neutral" or "No" because of a specific issue in a certain area. The questions were directed to ask for feedback on the overall content of the LCWIP, however, respondents would not respond "Yes" often because of local or personal issues. For the next consultation exercise, it is recommended that more choices are given ("Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Neutral", "Disagree", "Strongly Disagree") to provide

respondents with more options for expressing their opinions of the overall LCWIP, as well as raising concerns over area specific issues.

5.1 Recommendations for amendments to the Draft LCWIP

Several minor amendments to LCWIP documents are required:

- Updated description to Scheme 58 to include new bridge or an alternative solution
- Updated description of scheme 57 to note widening of Redway
- Refer to Sustrans Report for new infrastructure covering routes in Castlethorpe and Hanslope
- Scheme 32 extended to Tanfield Lane along the Brook
- Scheme 38 extended to Newport Road along the Brook

The below new schemes for LCWIP have been identified and need to be added to the long list. These schemes will be appraised following the LCWIP being adopted and help to inform the future delivery plan. These schemes are displayed in Figure 4-1.

- Castlethorpe to Hanslope Park (CE1)
- Add pinch point between Schemes 74 and 212 (CE2)
- New scheme connecting Weavers Hill, Fullers Slate to V4 Redway (CE3)
- New scheme connecting Stone Hill, Two Mile Ash with V4 Redway (CE4)
- Dangerous crossing point identified, Snowdon Drive and H6 Child's Way – same as Pentewan Gate - needs adding (CE5)
- Missing link between Kelly's Kitchen roundabout to Little Brickhill, parallel to the A5
- New scheme near Stadium MK. Existing Path and Cycle track needs upgrading to Redway to increase connectivity to Watling Street from Grafton Street. (CE6)
- New scheme: link Eaton Leys to Kelly's Kitchen roundabout (CE7)
- New scheme connecting Tongwell Street to Newport Road (CE8)

Upon reviewing these additional suggestions, these schemes proved to be obvious missing links and sensible suggestions.



Figure 11 - Consultation Exercise (CE) schemes

Annex A – The Consultation Questionnaire

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

Following the recent adoption of the Walking and Cycling Strategy, Milton Keynes Council has now developed the strategic active travel infrastructure plan – Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). The plan was developed by the consultant City Science and the Transport Policy Team, in line with Department for Transport Technical Guidance for LCWIPs.

In January 2021, town, ward and parish councillors had the opportunity to put forward specific local schemes that should be included in the plan. Close to a hundred schemes have been put forward and reviewed as part of a long list of a total of three hundred schemes. All schemes have been reviewed, evaluated and scored against a bespoke appraisal criteria, designed with the support of key stakeholders. This has resulted in the draft LCWIP, which sets out an ambitious vision for improving and expanding active travel infrastructure within the Milton Keynes borough.

We're now seeking your views, please have your say below.

Required

1. Please tell us who you are:

- Resident of Milton Keynes
- Business in Milton Keynes
- Councillor
- Milton Keynes Council Officer
- Local Community Group

2. Do you think Milton Keynes' draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan provides a clear strategy for the future investment in active travel infrastructure?

- Yes
- No
- Neutral

3. Any further comments on Question 2?

4. Do you agree with the appraisal method that has been developed to prioritise all schemes that have been put forward?

- Yes
- No
- Neutral

5. Any further comments on Questions 4?

6. Do you agree with results of the long list appraisal (see section 5.4 for the top scoring schemes, and the full list is included as Appendix B)?

- Yes
- No
- Neutral

7. Any further comments on Question 6?

8. Is there a particular area/scheme that affects you that you would like to provide comments on?

(Please provide details of the area/scheme number you are commenting on in your response).

(Please also send a screenshot of the area on a map that you're referring to on lcwip@milton-keynes.gov.uk).

9. Do you have any other general comments on the LCWIP report or supporting documents (Appendices A-D)?

10.(Optional) If you'd be happy to provide any further feedback on this consultation, please share your email address:

Contact details

Email – transport.policy@milton-keynes.gov.uk

Website - www.milton-keynes.gov.uk

Postal address – Civic Offices, 1 Saxon Gate East,
Central Milton Keynes, MK9 3EJ