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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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSI</td>
<td>Case Study Selection Index <em>(parameter created for this study from quantitative information on local authorities)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions <em>(British Government Department from 1998 till 2001)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of the Environment <em>(British Government Department till 1998)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoH</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoT</td>
<td>Department of Transport <em>(British Government Department till 1998)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTLR</td>
<td>Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions <em>(successor of DETR from 2001)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUA</td>
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<td>GB</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTP</td>
<td>Green Travel Plan</td>
</tr>
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<td>IHT</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Local Transport Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP/S</td>
<td>Local Transport Plan or Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Local Transport Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Metropolitan Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>National Consumer Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCF</td>
<td>National Cycle Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCN</td>
<td>National Cycle Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCS</td>
<td>National Cycling Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPG</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Guidance <em>(for Scotland)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>National Transport Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>Planning Advice Note <em>(for Scotland)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para.</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance <em>(for England &amp; Wales)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPI</td>
<td>Royal Town Planning Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS</td>
<td>Regional Transport Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRtS</td>
<td>Safe(r) Routes to School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUA</td>
<td>Scottish Unitary Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAL</td>
<td>Traffic Advisory Leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>Traffic Advisory Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Transport Research Laboratory <em>(was TRRL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRRL</td>
<td>Traffic and Roads Research Laboratory <em>(became TRL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom <em>(England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland - cf. GB)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUA</td>
<td>Welsh Unitary Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>