
Meeting: Traffic Management Meeting
Date: 26 January 2011
Subject: Proposed build-out and flat-topped road hump, Appenine Way, Leighton Buzzard
Report of: Basil Jackson Assistant Director for Highways and Transportation
Summary: To report to the Portfolio Holder for Safer Communities and Healthier Lifestyles the receipt of objections to a proposal to install a build-out and flat-topped road hump on Appenine Way, Leighton Buzzard.

Contact Officer: Amanda Tarbox, Assistant Engineer
amanda.tarbox@amey.co.uk
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: Planets
Function of: Council

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Council Priorities:

The proposal will promote sustainable modes of travel.

Financial:

There is currently £38,760 in the 2010 – 2011 program to deliver this scheme.

Legal:

None as a result of this report

Risk Management:

None as a result of this report

Staffing (including Trades Unions):

None as a result of this report

Equalities/Human Rights:

None as a result of this report

Community Safety:

The scheme will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Appenine Way.

Sustainability:

Implementation of this scheme may encourage people to walk or cycle instead of using less sustainable forms of transport, is in support of the Leighton Cycle Demonstration Town initiative, CBC and Government sustainability objectives and also the Leighton Linslade Modal Shift Exemplar Town objective.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

That the proposal to install a build out and flat-topped road hump on Appenine Way, Leighton Buzzard be implemented as advertised.

Background

1. In the 2010 – 2011 program there is a scheme to implement a raised crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Appenine Way to join the two footpaths that run east to west through the estate. The crossing point is proposed to be located approximately 40 metres south of the junction of North Star Drive with Appenine Way. This will take the form of a combination of a build-out and flat-topped road hump.
2. This scheme is following a scheme that was implemented last financial year to widen and resurface the footpath to the east of Appenine Way to create a shared use path for cyclists and pedestrians to use. The works are part of the ongoing programme of works to promote cycling in Leighton-Linslade.
3. In May 2010 a petition received by Central Bedfordshire Council representing 45 residents that live in North Star Drive, Omega Court and Nebular Court, Leighton Buzzard. The petition requested that a road safety review was carried out on Appenine Way, Leighton Buzzard on the section of Appenine Way that currently doesn't have any traffic calming (the western side from Hockliffe Road to Meadway).
4. The petition states that currently cars that are parked on Appenine Way and drivers, who allegedly speed along one part of Appenine Way, are causing difficulty for residents accessing Appenine Way safely by car or crossing Appenine Way as pedestrians.
5. This was considered by the portfolio holder on 6th July 2010. The advised that this scheme (to install a build-out and flat-topped road hump) was in the 2010-2011 works program which would address some of the issues raised by the petition. The report was approved.

Support

6. Three e-mails of support have been received:
7. Bedfordshire Police support the scheme. (see number 1)

8. A resident that lives within the vicinity of the proposed build-out and flat-topped road hump supports the scheme. (see number 2)
9. CTC (Cyclist's Touring Club) support the scheme. (see number 3)

Objections

10. Four objections (representing three households that live within the vicinity of the proposed build-out and flat-topped road hump, and one relative connected to one of these households) have been received.

11. Objection 1 (see number 4)

The Objection I have with the proposed plans are the issues it was cause us with Lack of parking and access to our house.

I live and own .. Apennine Way, LU7 3XZ.

Where your Plans are for and that is right out the front of my house and where me or My wife Park, and most the people who live in our row of houses.

We do have a car park out the back that gets Fairly full as it is for parking at night now there would have to be 6 more cars had to go in that would not fit at all.

Top of my Head 31 have 3 Cars, ME and my Wife have 1 each, 35 have 2 cars and 37 have a Full Drive way with lowered curbs and a Garage in the Car park the back.

But there is no way we are getting the extra 6 cars in that back one.

There is no Lighting in the car park at all at night and gets very Dark at night or Early morning's and as I have a baby one the way this would not be good for my wife and baby to not find a space and or walk in a dark car park trying to get into our garden that has a locked gate and then get in our back door.

12. Response

The proposed build-out measures 10 metres in length – this would displace two vehicles. Although there is a relatively high demand for on-street parking in this area, there should be space to accommodate these displaced vehicles on-street although not directly outside of their property.

The majority of properties in this area have some off-street parking, however since this estate was built the number of cars owned per property has increased, meaning that properties that have two or three cars per household don't necessarily have space to park all of their vehicles off-street.

It is likely that the residents find it more convenient to park on road at the front of their property as the estate is designed so that parking is generally located to the rear of properties or in blocks that are further away from the properties. Residents could make better use of off-street parking and improve the practicality of the available off-street parking for example by installing lighting.

13. Objection 2 (see number 5)

There are several reasons for the objections as follows:

My first concern is that no consideration has been taken whatsoever for the impact this work would have to us as homeowners - we will lose all our parking to the front and have the inconvenience of the traffic, the noise and the congestion right outside our property yet 100 yards to the right of us or two hundred yards to the left of us you would be able to build the ramp and it would not affect any home owners whatsoever.

When we purchased our house the view from the front was one of the selling points and you are now expecting us to accept an eyesore right outside our door which will take up the whole front of our house. In the past we contemplated requesting a dropped drive to accommodate another car as like most homes we have more than one car but we were conscious that this would spoil the look of the road and our property.

There is no doubt whatsoever that this work would affect us as homeowners and definitely reduce the value of our property.

I also have a disabled mother I care for and bring her to the home by car, this again would not be possible.

At present as I am sure you are aware there are parking issues as it is - not only do the occupants from the properties opposite us park their cars in our area as the majority have more than one car and only have one parking space to the rear of their properties.

Although we have a parking space at the rear invariably this has been taken up by unknown drivers as the spaces are not allocated to our address, plus the area to the rear is completely in the dark and the surface is uneven, if we do get the chance to park at the rear we are unable to get in from our back gates as these are locked for security reasons due to burglaries in the area - us being victims of this twice now over the years.

I am shocked that your proposal has not taken into consideration us as homeowners, I agree that the roads should be safe and cycle routes provided, in fact we could of complained regarding the cycle path to the side as we have no end of trouble with mopeds from this path plus when it was erected damage was done to our own fence. I cannot understand why directly outside our property has been deemed a suitable spot when as I have said before there are several areas that this work could be carried without affecting any residents.

I await your reply as under the circumstances this has caused a lot of upset for my family and if need be I will take further advice as I feel this should of been looked at in more detail as to the impact on the homeowners who will be affected by this work

I am concerned that it has not been noted that the spot you feel is suitable for the hump is not suitable at all in fact it is a blind spot.

I am concerned that the government are reducing funds for Councils to spend yet the works you have only just completed would have been a waste of money, and I believe Road Humps are not deemed necessary under Bedfordshire Council.

Yours Faithfully

14. Response

The build-out has been designed to be 1.8 metres wide – this is approximately the same width as a car, leaving a remaining carriageway width of 5.7 metres. This is a sufficient carriageway width for two cars to pass one another so should not make any difference to the existing levels of noise and congestion as often vehicles are parked here.

The proposed build-out and flat-topped road hump has been designed as a crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists to use and has been situated at this location to join the two footpaths that run east to west through the estate.

The existing dropped kerb at this location has reduced visibility due to parked vehicles either side; the aim of the scheme is to improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists wanting to cross the road at this location, particularly children attending local schools.

It would be possible to use the build-out and flat-topped road hump to set down and pick up passengers.

The proposed build-out measures 10 metres in length – this would displace two vehicles. Although there is a relatively high demand for on-street parking in this area, there should be space to accommodate these displaced vehicles on-street although not directly outside of their property.

The majority of properties in this area have some off-street parking, however since this estate was built the number of cars owned per property has increased, not all car owners necessarily have space to park all of their vehicles off-street.

It is likely that the residents find it more convenient to park on road at the front of their property as the estate is designed so that parking is generally located to the rear of properties or in blocks that are further away from the properties.

The section of Appenine Way where the proposed build-out and flat-topped road hump is to be located is relatively straight with good visibility; however vehicles parked along this section do reduce the visibility for vehicles at the junction with North Star Drive and for pedestrians and cyclists crossing the road.

15. Objection 3 (see number 6)

I am so very concerned about the alterations you are planning to do outside my daughter's house in Appenine Way. I am a disabled lady in her 80's and my daughter has to collect me in her car to take me to her house and with what you are planning to do there will be nowhere for her to park the car and I am very worried, why can't this work be done further down Appenine Way – near the park which will not interfere with anyones property. Regarding the back entrance to my daughter's house I have tried this but the ground is very uneven and dark and I am afraid of falling. Please give this your kind consideration.

Response

The proposed build-out and flat-topped road hump has been designed as a crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists to use and has been situated at this location to join the two footpaths that run east to west through the estate. The existing dropped kerb at this location has reduced visibility due to parked vehicles either side; the aim of the scheme is to improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists wanting to cross the road at this location, particularly children attending local schools.

The build-out and flat-topped road hump can be used to set down and pick up passengers and will have a flush surface between the carriageway and the footway.

Objection 4 (see number 7)

The main reason for my objection is the reduction in parking spaces that this proposed scheme will cause. This section of Appenine Way has more houses fronting the road and therefore has cars parked on the road in front of the houses because the houses do not have driveways, and I believe the installation of this road hump will reduce the parking spaces by about 3, thus resulting in more congestion which in turn could cause more hazards to pedestrians and cyclists.

I have lived in No... Appenine Way for 6 years now and have never seen any problems with people crossing Appenine Way between the two shared-use paths, however I do appreciate that there is a speeding issue along this section of Appenine Way especially at night. I believe that other measures to reduce speed, such as speed bumps, would be better suited to this section of Appenine Way rather than the proposed build-out road hump.

Response

Although the properties along this section of Appenine Way do not have driveways they do have a rear communal parking area; however properties that have two or three cars per household don't necessarily have space to park all of their vehicles off-street and are also likely to find it more convenient to park on the road outside the front of their property.

The proposed build-out measures 10 metres in length – this would displace two vehicles. Although there is a relatively high demand for on-street parking in this area, there should be space to accommodate these displaced vehicles on-street.

In May 2010 a petition was sent to Central Bedfordshire Council representing a total of 45 residents that live in North Star Drive, Omega Court and Nebular Court, Leighton Buzzard. The petition states that currently cars that are parked on Appenine Way and drivers, who typically speed along one part of Appenine Way, are causing difficulty to the residents to obtain access onto Appenine Way safely by car or to cross Appenine Way safely as a pedestrian.

The preliminary aim of this scheme is to improve the crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Appenine Way at this point; other forms of traffic calming such as speed cushions would not serve this purpose; if a road hump was installed without a build-out it would be likely to be parked across.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Plan

Appendix B – Responses to consultation including representations

Background Papers: (open to public inspection)

None

Location of papers: Priory House, Chicksands



- NOTES**
1. This drawing to be used in conjunction with all other Engineering drawings
 2. Details out of all works to be agreed on site with Highways
 3. All existing ground features to remain in place unless otherwise stated
 4. All signs to be in accordance with The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2007

Client	CH2C
Project Name	Apperline Way road crossing, Leighton Buzzard
Client Ref	1501
Project Ref	1501
Issue	001
Revision	001
Author	AS
Checked	AS
Drawn	AS
Scale	1:100
Date	15/01/2012
Project No	BH-400828-001-002
Rev	P0

Appendix B

Number 1



PROPOSED Build out and flat-topped road hump in Appenine Way, Leighton Buzzard.

Your Reference: AMT/45538/400629/3.12

<p>This Authority has considered the proposed Traffic Regulation Order as outlined in your letter and offer the following comments for further consideration.</p> <p>Comments</p>	
<p>This Authority has considered the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders as outlined in your letter dated the 2nd December 2010, together with the reason(s) given. The proposals are accepted by this authority, therefore no objections will be offered.</p>	X

Name: - ...Steve Welham

Address ...Traffic Management Section,

Bedford Heights, Manton Lane,

Bedford. MK41 7PH

Signed:- ...S. P. Welham.

Number 2

From:

Sent: 04 December 2010 18:26

To: Tarbox, Amanda

Subject: Proposed Road Hump - Appenine Way

Dear Amanda

My name is I live at .. Appenine Way, as a mother of two I will be really pleased to see any measure that makes crossing the road on Appenine Way safer. My daughters and I cross the road at this point almost every day and have had difficulty crossing safely.

Could you possibly tell me exactly what a uncontrolled crossing point means as my Husband and I were not sure!!!!

Does it mean a signed crossing with no zebra crossing, or traffic lights??????

I look forward to hearing from you

Yours Faithfully

Number 3

From:

Sent: 19 December 2010 14:24

To: Chapman, Nick

Subject: speed table, Appenine Way, LB

Thank you for notifying CTC about the speed table proposed for Appenine Way, Leighton Buzzard. I have consulted my colleague, who is the appointed CTC representative for the Linslade-Leighton Cycle Town project, and we support this proposal.

Number 4

From:

Sent: 10 December 2010 16:28

To: Tarbox, Amanda;

Cc:

Subject: I wish to Object to a Proposal please (ref - AMT/45538/400629/3.12)

Hello Amanda

I wish to Object to a Proposal please (ref - AMT/45538/400629/3.12)

The Objection I have with the proposed plans are the issues it was cause us with Lack of parking and access to our house.

I live and own .. Appenine Way, LU7 3XZ.

Where your Plans are for and that is right out the front of my house and where me or My wife Park, and most the people who live in our row of houses.

We do have a car park out the back that gets Fairly full as it is for parking at night now there would have to be 6 more cars had to go in that would not fit at all.

Top of my Head 31 have 3 Cars, ME and my Wife have 1 each, 35 have 2 cars and 37 have a Full Drive way with lowered curbs and a Garage in the Car park the back.

But there is no way we are getting the extra 6 cars in that back one.

There is no Lighting in the car park at all at night and gets very Dark at night or Early morning's and as I have a baby one the way this would not be good for my wife and baby to not find a space and or walk in a dark car park trying to get into our garden that has a locked gate and then get in our back door.

Number 5

From:

Sent: 16 December 2010 16:47

To: Tarbox, Amanda

Cc: Central Beds Consultation

Subject: Proposed road hump- Appenine Way, Leighton Buzzard

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to advise you that I object to the proposed works as per your letter dated 2/12/2010
Ref: AMT/45538/400629/3.12.

There are several reasons for the objections as follows:

My first concern is that no consideration has been taken whatsoever for the impact this work would have to us as homeowners - we will lose all our parking to the front and have the inconvenience of the traffic, the noise and the congestion right outside our property yet 100 yards to the right of us or two hundred yards to the left of us you would be able to build the ramp and it would not affect any home owners whatsoever.

When we purchased our house the view from the front was one of the selling points and you are now expecting us to accept an eyesore right outside our door which will take up the whole front of our house. In the past we contemplated requesting a dropped drive to accommodate another car as like most homes we have more than one car but we were conscious that this would spoil the look of the road and our property.

There is no doubt whatsoever that this work would affect us as homeowners and definitely reduce the value of our property.

I also have a disabled mother I care for and bring her to the home by car, this again would not be possible.

At present as I am sure you are aware there are parking issues as it is - not only do the occupants from the properties opposite us park their cars in our area as the majority have more than one car and only have one parking space to the rear of their properties.

Although we have a parking space at the rear invariably this has been taken up by unknown drivers as the spaces are not allocated to our address, plus the area to the rear is completely in the dark and the surface is uneven, if we do get the chance to park at the rear we are unable to get in from our back gates as these are locked for security reasons due to burglaries in the area - us being victims of this twice now over the years.

I am shocked that your proposal has not taken into consideration us as homeowners, I agree that the roads should be safe and cycle routes provided, in fact we could of complained regarding the cycle path to the side as we have no end of trouble with mopeds from this path plus when it was erected damage was done to our own fence. I cannot understand why directly outside our property has been deemed a suitable spot when as I have said before there are several areas that this work could be carried without affecting any residents.

I await your reply as under the circumstances this has caused a lot of upset for my family and if need be I will take further advice as I feel this should of been looked at in more detail as to the impact on the homeowners who will be affected by this work

I am concerned that it has not been noted that the spot you feel is suitable for the hump is not suitable at all in fact it is a blind spot.

I am concerned that the government are reducing funds for Councils to spend yet the works you have only just completed would have been a waste of money, and I believe Road Humps are not deemed necessary under Bedfordshire Council.

Yours Faithfully

144398

REIGNTON BUZZARD
BROS.

20 DEC 2010

14th Dec 2010

3.12E - APPENINE WAY

Dear Sirs

I am so very concerned about the alterations you are planning to do outside my daughters house in Appennine way I am a disabled lady in her 80's and my daughter has to collect me in her car to take me to her house and with what you are planning to do there will be no where for her to park the car

and I am very worried, why cant this
work be done further down
Appenine Way - near the Park
which will not interfere with
anyone's Property. Regarding
the back entrance to my
daughters house I have tried this
but the ground is very uneven
& dark and I am afraid of
falling.

Please give this your
kind consideration

Yours faithfully

Number 7

From:

Sent: 23 December 2010 08:25

To: Central Beds Consultation

Subject: Proposed Road Hump - Appennine Way

Dear Transportation Manager,

With reference to the proposed Road Hump in Appennine Way, Leighton Buzzard, between the Junctions of Pegasus Road and North Star Drive, I would like to record my objections to this proposed new road hump.

The main reason for my objection is the reduction in parking spaces that this proposed scheme will cause. This section of Appennine Way has more houses fronting the road and therefore has cars parked on the road in front of the houses because the houses do not have driveways, and I believe the installation of this road hump will reduce the parking spaces by about 3, thus resulting in more congestion which in turn could cause more hazards to pedestrians and cyclists.

I have lived in No.... Appennine Way for 6years now and have never seen any problems with people crossing Appennine Way between the two shared-use paths, however I do appreciate that there is a speeding issue along this section of Appennine Way especially at night. I believe that other measures to reduce speed, such as speed bumps, would be better suited to this section of Appennine Way rather than the proposed build-out road hump.

I trust the above will be given due diligence, and should you have any queries then please do not hesitate to contact myself at the following:

Yours Sincerely,