
**The implementation of
walking and cycling policies
in British local authorities –
idea(l)s into action?**

Philine Gaffron

submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

awarded by Napier University

January 2002

Citation & Contact

Please cite this thesis as follows:

Gaffron, Philine (2002) <i>The implementation of walking and cycling policies in British local authorities – idea(l)s into action?</i> PhD Thesis, Napier University, Edinburgh; urn:nbn:de:gbv:830-tubdok-3611

The urn given above is the universal resource number assigned to the on-line version of this document, which can be found on <http://doku.b.tu-harburg.de/>

You can contact the author under the following e-mail address: p.gaffron_at_tu-harburg.de

Abstract

There is a growing emphasis in public and political discourse on finding alternatives to the current car-based patterns of personal travel. As a consequence the interest in walking and cycling as socially, economically and environmentally sustainable modes of travel has increased and this thesis investigates the process of walking and cycling policy implementation in British local authorities. The results of a quantitative questionnaire survey are combined with in depth qualitative case studies of local authorities which were selected through a Case Study Selection Index developed especially for this thesis. The study identifies conditions and factors which determine implementation outcomes and develops a conceptual model, which relates these factors to each other.

This is the first study which investigates the implementation process – rather than its outcomes - in one British policy area on such a large scale. One of its aims is to make the results relevant and accessible to local implementation practitioners. For this purpose the findings are consolidated into a set of guidelines, which use the new conceptual implementation model to present the potential opportunities, problems and solutions relevant to walking and cycling policy implementation. The guidelines are aimed at helping practitioners at all levels, who wish to improve implementation outcomes. The conceptual model makes an important contribution to both the theoretical discourse about implementation which has seen relatively little development in recent years and the analysis of implementation in praxis. Together, guidelines and model – hopefully - are a useful, simple and practical tool for helping practitioners to improve the implementation processes they are involved in.

Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to all the people in local authorities who gave up their time to fill in my questionnaire and agreed to be interviewed. This thesis would not have been possible without them and it was encouraging to meet so much enthusiasm and dedication in what is obviously not always an easy job.

I would like to thank my supervisors Julian Hine and Tom Rye for the support which they have given me and Tom also for his unfailing enthusiasm about my work.

A big thank you to Rachel Goodman for her excellent comments and to Joanne Sibbald for agreeing to take on the typing up my interview recordings and doing a great job. I also want to thank my colleagues at the Transport Research Institute for providing all the little and big things without which days at the office would have become a soulless affair.

Thanks are due to Beth Meyer for making her text marking macro available on the internet, my work would have been a lot more difficult without it.

The final position on this important list is reserved for my partner Caroline Hoffmann, who helped me with the proof reading, gave me her advice and kept me going when I was trying to do too many things at once. Thank you.

Author's declaration

I declare that no material contained in this thesis has been used in any other submission for an academic award and that the work presented is my own.

This thesis is copyright material and no quotation or excerpt from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

(signed in copy submitted for examination)

Philine Gaffron

Contents

LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xi
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 THE WIDER IMPORTANCE OF WALKING AND CYCLING AS MODES OF TRANSPORT	1
1.1.1 Sustainable development	2
1.1.2 Land use	3
1.1.3 Air quality and climate change	5
1.1.4 Health	6
1.1.5 Social Exclusion	8
1.2 RELEVANCE OF THIS STUDY	8
1.3 AIMS OF THIS STUDY	9
1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	10
1.5 GEOGRAPHICAL AND MODAL PARAMETERS OF THIS STUDY	11
1.6 LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN - THE POPULATION UNDER INVESTIGATION	11
1.7 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS	12
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW	13
2.1 THE CURRENT POLICY AND GUIDANCE FRAMEWORK FOR WALKING AND CYCLING IN BRITAIN	13
2.1.1 The National Cycling Strategy, 1996	14
2.1.2 The Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997 and Road Traffic Reduction (National Targets) Act 1998	16
2.1.3 The Transport White Papers 1998	17
2.1.4 Policies for road user charging	19
2.1.5 Integrated Transport Bills 2000	19
2.1.6 Safe(r) Routes to School, Cycle Challenge Schemes & Home Zones	20
2.1.7 Inconsistencies in government policy	22
2.1.8 Planning Policy Guidance	23
2.1.9 Guidance on provision for pedestrians and cyclists	28
2.1.10 Conclusions	33
2.2 WALKING AND CYCLING IN LOCAL AUTHORITIES – CURRENT PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS	34
2.2.1 Walking	35
2.2.2 Cycling	49
2.2.3 Walking and cycling policies in Local Transport Plans and Strategies	62

2.2.4	Conclusions	63
2.3	IMPLEMENTATION THEORY	64
2.3.1	Introduction	64
2.3.2	The top-down approach	66
2.3.3	Bottom-up models and their derivatives	70
2.3.4	Intra-organisational processes	72
2.3.5	Inter-organisational dynamics	77
2.3.6	Policy types	77
2.3.7	Conclusions - towards a theoretical framework for analysis?	78
2.4	CASE STUDIES OF POLICY IMPLEMENTATION	83
2.4.1	USA - Reducing vehicle emissions	83
2.4.2	Great Britain - cycle routes in Portsmouth	86
2.4.3	Conclusions	87
2.5	SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS STUDY	88
2.5.1	Research questions answered	88
2.5.2	Implications for this study	91
CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY	<hr/>	93
3.1	INTRODUCTION	93
3.2	QUALITATIVE OR QUANTITATIVE METHODS?	93
3.3	CHOOSING THE SAMPLE	95
3.4	METHODS USED IN THIS STUDY	96
3.4.1	Focus Groups	96
3.4.2	Questionnaire survey	99
3.4.3	Case Studies	107
CHAPTER 4 - FOCUS GROUP AND QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS	<hr/>	113
4.1	INTRODUCTION	113
4.2	ANALYSIS OF THE FOCUS GROUPS	113
4.2.1	Characteristics of the local authority	114
4.2.2	Awareness issues	115
4.2.3	Interactions between different groups, departments, policy areas, local authorities and the public	116
4.2.4	Local sources of influence on walking and cycling policy implementation	117
4.2.5	National sources of influence on walking and cycling policy implementation	117
4.2.6	Resource issues	118
4.2.7	Specific measures, which have been or are being implemented	119
4.2.8	Future chances of walking and cycling policies in the local authority	120

4.2.9 Summary and implications for this thesis	120
4.3 ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA	122
4.3.1 The sample	122
4.3.2 Selection of Case Studies	125
4.3.3 Activities and information relating to walking and cycling	125
4.3.4 Awareness and use of policy and guidance documents	135
4.3.5 Factors influencing policy adoption and implementation	138
4.3.6 The characteristics of the most and least active local authorities – comparing the top and bottom quartiles of the CSSI	145
4.4 CONCLUSIONS	150
4.4.1 What provisions are local authorities making for walking and cycling in terms of policy, administration and in terms of measures on the ground?	151
4.4.2 What conditions and processes within an authority are likely to be conducive to successful implementation of walking and cycling policies?	151
4.4.3 What types of local authorities are more likely to implement measures to encourage walking and cycling ?	153
 CHAPTER 5 - ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDY DATA	 155
5.1 INTRODUCTION	155
5.2 INFLUENTIAL AGENTS AND FACTORS	159
5.2.1 Characteristics of the local authority	159
5.2.2 Awareness and culture within and outside the authority	163
5.2.3 Officers	168
5.2.4 Councillors and other politicians	170
5.2.5 The written word - policies, strategies and other documents	172
5.2.6 Resource issues	179
5.2.7 The mechanics of implementation	187
5.2.8 Politics	189
5.3 INTERACTIONS WITHIN EACH AUTHORITY	191
5.3.1 Officers, groups and departments	191
5.3.2 Modes	195
5.3.3 Other policy areas	197
5.4 AUTHORITIES' INTERACTIONS WITH OTHERS	198
5.4.1 Interest groups, lobby groups and the general public	198
5.4.2 Schools	205
5.4.3 Developers	206
5.4.4 Other councils	270
5.5 EXISTING AND PLANNED PROVISIONS FOR PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS	209
5.6 WALKING AND CYCLING POLICIES IN THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES STUDIED	211
5.7 FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WALKING AND CYCLING POLICIES	216

5.8 CONCLUSIONS	218
5.8.1 Walking and cycling policies in the case study authorities	219
5.8.2 Discrepancies between policies and implementation and reasons why - implementation barriers	222
5.8.3 Factors and processes conducive to successful implementation of walking and cycling policies – the bridges	226
5.8.4 The CSSI and findings from qualitative data	232
CHAPTER 6 – DECISION MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF WALKING AND CYCLING POLICIES – HOW PRACTICE RELATES TO THEORY _____	235
6.1 INTRODUCTION	235
6.2 THE DETERMINANTS OF IMPLEMENTATION RESULTS	236
6.2.1 The policy formation process	236
6.2.2 The Implementation Process	241
6.2.3 Implementation Results - outputs and outcomes	249
6.3 CONCLUSIONS	251
6.3.1 Proposal for a revised conceptual model of policy implementation	251
6.3.2 How implementation theory relates to the findings of this study	253
CHAPTER 7 – WALKING AND CYCLING POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN PRAXIS ___	257
7.1 INTRODUCTION	257
7.2 EXTERNAL FACTORS	259
7.3 THE NATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT	261
7.4 THE LOCAL POLICY FORMATION PROCESS	263
7.5 INTER-ORGANISATIONAL PROCESSES	264
7.6 INTRA-ORGANISATIONAL PROCESSES	266
7.7 BEHAVIOUR OF INDIVIDUAL LOCAL ACTORS	269
7.8 TARGET GROUP BEHAVIOUR	270
7.9 IMPLEMENTATION RESULTS – OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES	271
7.10 CONCLUSIONS	272
CHAPTER 8 - SUMMARY AND IDEAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH _____	275
8.1 INTRODUCTION	275
8.2 FINDINGS	276
8.2.1 Defining implementation success	276
8.2.2 A new conceptual model for studying and optimising policy implementation	277
8.2.3 The national policy framework	277
8.2.4 Differences between walking and cycling policy and implementation	278
8.2.5 Implementation activities within local authorities	278

8.3 FUTURE RESEARCH	279
8.3.1 Implementation theory	279
8.3.2 Walking and cycling policy implementation in British local authorities	280
8.4 IDEA(L)S INTO ACTION?	281
APPENDIX A - DECISION MAKING ANALYSIS	
A.1 INTRODUCTION	283
A.2 RATIONAL CHOICE DEBATE AND INCREMENTALISM	286
A.2.1 Rational comprehensive model and bounded rationality	286
A.2.2 The incremental model or 'the science of muddling through'	290
A.2.3 The normative-optimum model and the mixed scanning approach	292
A.3 DECISION MAKING IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT	294
A.4 CONCLUSIONS	296
APPENDIX B - NON-TRANSPORT RELATED IMPLEMENTATION CASE STUDIES	
B.1 USA	297
B.1.1 The New Communities Programme	298
B.1.2 Racial desegregation of US schools	298
B.1.3 The compensatory education programme	299
B.1.4 The Fluoride Mouth Rinse Programme	300
B.2 GREAT BRITAIN	302
B.2.1 A Survey of Local Agenda 21 implementers	302
B.2.2 Local Authority Environmental Strategy Managers	303
APPENDIX C – SCRIPT FOR EXPLORATORY FOCUS GROUPS	
	305
APPENDIX D – SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE CASE STUDY SELECTION INDEX	
	307
APPENDIX E - CHECK LIST FOR POLICY DOCUMENTS SUPPLIED BY CASE STUDIES	
	309
APPENDIX F – SAMPLE OF COVERING LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE	
	312
APPENDIX G – QUESTIONS FOR CASE STUDY INTERVIEWS	
	332
APPENDIX H - CODING SHEET FOR INTERVIEW ANALYSIS	
	336
APPENDIX I - AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES CHOSEN AS CASE STUDIES	
	339
APPENDIX J – WALKING AND CYCLING MEASURES DISCUSSED IN CASE STUDY INTERVIEWS	
	346
REFERENCES	
	353

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Research questions for this study	10
Table 2.1 Guidance material published by the National Cycling Forum	31
Table 3.1 Classification of research questions	94
Table 3.2 Advantages and disadvantages of the three most common quantitative survey techniques (adapted from Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996 and Mangione, 1998).....	99
Table 3.3 Proposed structure of postal questionnaire to be sent to British local authorities	101
Table 3.4 Strategies for maximising response rates to mail surveys (adapted from Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996; Mangione, 1998)	102
Table 4.1 Subject categories arising from focus groups and number of individual points raised which fall into each category.....	113
Table 4.2 Population, area and council tax band D of responding local authorities (calculated from data obtained from the Municipal Year Book; Municipal Journal, 2000) and results of one way ANOVA comparing these variables between different types of local authorities	124
Table 4.3 Determination of Case Study Selection Index Scores through other numerical descriptors of local authorities.....	126
Table 4.4 Case studies as selected through CSSI scores (given in brackets) in each type of local authority	127
Table 4.5 Frequency and length of existence of the posts of walking and cycling officers and comparative statistics	128
Table 4.6 Percentages of different authority types, which have adopted targets for increasing the modal share of walking and cycling (authority types are listed in descending order of mean CSSI scores).....	130
Table 4.7 Proportion of respondents, who provided figures for the existing modal share of walking and and cycling in their local authority.....	130
Table 4.8 Proportion of respondents who monitor given indicators	131
Table 4.9 Crosstabulation of stages of development of walking and cycling strategies with the existence of Safe(r) Routes to School type projects and Home Zones (figures in percent of entire sample).....	131
Table 4.10 Comparative mean scores (\bar{x}) of awareness and availability of documents for all local authorities (LAs) and disaggregated by type (Q31); the three lowest means in each column are shaded grey	135

Table 4.11 Results of Mann Whitney U test for differences in awareness of six documents between respondents from different authority types	136
Table 4.12 Comparative mean scores (\bar{x}) describing frequency of use of listed documents by respondents from all local authorities (LAs) and disaggregated by type (Q32); the three lowest means in each column are shaded grey.....	137
Table 4.13 The comparative average importance of different factors in adopting walking (Q29) and cycling (Q30) policies as rated by all authorities.....	138
Table 4.14 The top three ranking factors (by mean score) contributing to the adoption of walking (Q29) and cycling (Q30) policies in different authority types.....	140
Table 4.15 The comparative average importance of different factors in hindering the drafting and implementation of walking (Q47) and cycling (Q49) policies as rated by all authorities.....	141
Table 4.16 The top three ranking factors (by mean score) hindering the drafting and implementation of walking (Q47) and cycling (Q49) policies in different authority types	142
Table 4.17 The comparative average importance of different factors in helping the implementation of walking (Q51) and cycling (Q53) policies as rated by all authorities.....	143
Table 4.18 The top three ranking factors (by mean score) found to be helpful in the implementation of walking (Q51) and cycling (Q53) policies by different authority types	144
Table 4.19 Authorities in the top and bottom CSSI quartiles	146
Table 4.20 Differences in infrastructure between high and low scoring local authorities (χ^2 calculated using Yate's continuity correction for 2x2 contingency tables)	148
Table 4.21 Differences in monitoring activity between high and low scoring local authorities (χ^2 calculated using Yate's continuity correction for 2x2 contingency tables)	148
Table 4.22 Differences between top and bottom quartiles in the judgement of factors important in helping to implement walking and cycling policies (Mann Whitney U test).....	150
Table 5.1 Size and political composition as well as posts, policies and monitoring activities relating to walking and cycling in authorities chosen as case studies.....	157
Table 5.2 External funding sources and their application.....	182
Table 5.3 Policy links discussed in different local authorities	197
Table 5.4 An overview of consultation partners and mechanisms mentioned by case study interviewees	202
Table 5.5 Overview of the number of walking, cycling or combined schemes mentioned in each case study.....	210

Table 5.6 Analysis of walking and cycling policies in local authorities chosen as case studies (✓ = issue is mentioned/covered specifically in relation to the mode in one authority’s policy document; hence a maximum of six ticks is possible per cell)	214
Table 5.7 Summary of planned and implemented walking and cycling schemes discussed by interviewees	220
Table 5.8 Case study local authorities ranked by CSSI score and by numerical score of qualitative data	233
Table 6.1 The relationship between theories of implementation and the findings of this study ...	253
Table A.1 Comparison of the rational comprehensive and bounded rationality models of decision making (adapted from Lindblom, 1959, p.81)	291
Table I.1 Details of case study interviewees (each row represents one type of local authority, dotted lines indicate that interviews were conducted separately)	344
Table J.1 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Suffolk CC.....	346
Table J.2 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interviews at Worcestershire CC.....	346
Table J.3 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at York EUA.....	347
Table J.4 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Luton EUA.....	348
Table J.5 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Bury MBC	348
Table J.6 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Oldham MBC.....	349
Table J.7 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Kensington & Chelsea LB	349
Table J.8 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Lambeth LB.....	350
Table J.9 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Flintshire WUA.....	351
Table J.10 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Merthyr Tydfil WUA....	351
Table J.11 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at Falkirk SUA.....	351
Table J.12 Walking and cycling schemes mentioned during interview at East Renfrewshire SUA	352

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 The implementation process and determinants of the implementation result (from Winter, 1990).....	81
Figure 4.1 Percentage of different local authority types represented in the entire population (n=204) and in the sample of returned questionnaires (n=92).....	122
Figure 4.2 Comparison of simple political majority in population and ruling parties in sample...	123
Figure 4.3 In which type of area does the majority of the LA's population live?	125
Figure 4.4 Mean Case Study Selection Index scores of the six different local authority types	126
Figure 4.5 Stages of development of walking and cycling strategies/policies	129
Figure 4.6 Level of activity of local lobby groups throughout the sample (in percent of valid responses received)	133
Figure 4.7 Number of authorities which co-operate with different bodies and organisations on walking and cycling issues	133
Figure 4.8 Respondents assessment of their authority's success in implementing walking and cycling policies	134
Figure 6.1 The implementation process and determinants of the implementation result (from Winter, 1990).....	236
Figure 6.2 Revised version of Winter's model of implementation determinants (1990) showing the findings of this thesis	252
Figure 7.1 Conceptual model of walking and cycling policy implementation determinants adapted from Winter (1990) in the light of the findings of this study (simplified from Figure 6.2).....	258
Figure A.1 A general model of the decision making process in British local government involving chief officers, committees and the council (elected members); from Friend & Jessop (1969).....	295

Acronyms and abbreviations

CC	County Council
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CSSI	Case Study Selection Index (<i>parameter created for this study from quantitative information on local authorities</i>)
DC	District Council
DETR	Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions (<i>British Government Department from 1998 till 2001</i>)
DoE	Department of the Environment (<i>British Government Department till 1998</i>)
DoH	Department of Health
DoT	Department of Transport (<i>British Government Department till 1998</i>)
D'TLR	Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (<i>successor of DETR from 2001</i>)
EU	European Union
EUA	English Unitary Authority
GB	Great Britain (<i>England, Scotland, Wales</i>)
GTP	Green Travel Plan
IHT	Institute of Highways and Transportation
LA	local authority
LB	London Borough
LTP	Local Transport Plan
LTP/S	Local Transport Plan or Strategy
LTS	Local Transport Strategy
MB	Metropolitan Borough
NCC	National Consumer Council
NCF	National Cycle Forum
NCN	National Cycle Network
NCS	National Cycling Strategy
NPPG	National Planning Policy Guidance (<i>for Scotland</i>)
NTS	National Transport Statistics
PAN	Planning Advice Note (<i>for Scotland</i>)
para.	paragraph
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance (<i>for England & Wales</i>)
RTPI	Royal Town Planning Institute
RTS	Regional Transport Strategy
SRtS	Safe(r) Routes to School
SUA	Scottish Unitary Authority

TAL	Traffic Advisory Leaflet
TAU	Traffic Advisory Unit
TRL	Transport Research Laboratory (<i>was TRRL</i>)
TRRL	Traffic and Roads Research Laboratory (<i>became TRL</i>)
UK	United Kingdom (<i>England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland - cf. GB</i>)
WHO	World Health Organisation
WUA	Welsh Unitary Authority