
Meeting: Traffic Management Meeting
Date: 29 January 2014
Subject: Faulkner's Way and St Mary's Way Area, Leighton-Linslade – Residents Permit Parking Scheme Amendments and Residents' Submissions
Report of: Jane Moakes, Assistant Director Environmental Services
Summary: The purpose of this report is to consider objections to the published amendments to the recently introduced residents permit parking schemes in Faulkner's Way and St Mary's Way, Beech Grove, Hawthorn Close and Cherry Tree Walk, Leighton-Linslade. A Petition from residents in the St Mary's Way area has been received and results of a locally organised consultation of Faulkner's Way residents have also been submitted.

Contact Officer: Nick Chapman
nick.chapman@amey.co.uk
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: Linslade
Function of: Council

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Council Priorities:

To improve highway safety, facilitate the free flow of traffic and improve the amenity of streets for residents.

Financial:

The proposed amendments to the two permit parking zones will cost approximately £7,000 in design fees, including processing of the required traffic regulation order, and the required traffic signing works.

Legal:

None from this report

Risk Management:

None from this report

Staffing (including Trades Unions):

None from this report

Equalities/Human Rights:

None from this report

Community Safety:

None from this report

Sustainability:

None from this report

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- a) **That the proposed amendments to the residents permit parking schemes be implemented as published.**
- b) **That the St Mary's Way petition and Faulkner's Way submission be noted.**
- c) **That the lead petitioner and organiser be informed of the decision following consideration of the petition and submission.**

Background

1. Funding was made available in the 2012/13 and 2013/14 financial years to introduce on-street parking controls in several residential areas of Leighton-Linslade that suffered from all-day commuter parking. This included both the St Mary's Way area and Faulkner's Way. Following an extensive public consultation process residents' permit parking schemes in both areas were introduced in September 2013.
2. In the weeks after implementation, residents of both areas have expressed concerns about certain aspects of the schemes. As a result of the new arrangements, all on-street parking is restricted to permit holders only at all times. Some residents feel that this is overly restrictive and has resulted in high costs for visitors permit.
3. In addition, some residents of Stoke Road who have no off-road parking have raised concerns about the impact the Falkner's Way scheme has had on their ability to park near to their homes. Whenever possible they park in the unrestricted lay-by located immediately opposite their home to the south of Faulkner's Way, but if spaces are unavailable they have parked in Faulkner's Way itself. However, they are no longer able to do that because they are not eligible to apply for a permit to park in Faulkner's Way.

Published Amendments to the St Mary's Way area and Faulkner's Way Zones

4. As a result of the aforementioned concerns, the Council decided to publish proposals to amend the existing parking schemes, as follows:-
 - a) To amend the residents' permit parking schemes in both Faulkner's Way and the St Mary's Way area to allow vehicles to be parked for up to 2 hours without a permit. This is intended to address residents' concerns about the need for drivers to display a parking permit, even when parking on-street for short periods.

- b) To add the lay-by in Stoke Road to the Faulkner's Way zone and allow specified residents of Stoke Road and their visitors to purchase a permit to park in the new extended zone.
5. The amendments were advertised by public notice in November 2013. Consultations were carried out with the emergency services and other statutory bodies, Leighton-Linslade Town Council and relevant Elected Members. Residents of the two zones were individually consulted by letter and notices were displayed on street.
6. A total of 13 individual representations have been received. 4 of those are objections to the St Mary's Way area proposal. There were a total of 9 representations relating to Faulkner's Way, of which 5 are objections to the published amendments and 1 contains general comments. The remaining 3 are objections from Stoke Road residents. Copies of the correspondence received in response to the published proposals are included in Appendix B and C.
7. The main points of objection relating to the St Mary's Way area are included in Appendix B and are summarised below:-
 - a) The permit scheme should apply during the working day only or even for just 2 hours per day. Alternatively apply the proposed 2 hour permit-free parking to the working day only as has been used elsewhere in the town.
 - b) Some residents of Soulbury Road have used St Mary's Way for 'overflow' parking due to on-street restrictions in Soulbury Road itself and are no longer able to use it. The Council should allow residents of Soulbury Road to apply for a permit to park in the St Mary's Way area.
 - c) The cost of permits is too high. There should be lower costs for people with disabilities and/or financial difficulties. Visitor permits should be re-usable.
 - d) Remove Hawthorn Close from the scheme.
 - e) The proposed 2 hour permit-free change is still too restrictive because visitors stay longer and the cost of visitor permits is too high.
8. The Highways team's response to the individual representations raised in paragraph 7 are as follows:-
 - a) It is entirely possible to have residents permit parking schemes that operate on a part-time basis. However, in some existing permit zones the Council often receives complaints about non-resident parking during the evening and weekend. Residents find it frustrating that having purchased a permit they are unable to find a parking space at the very time they need it. Also, increasing numbers of people work outside of the traditional Monday to Friday 9-5 working day, so if the times of the scheme were reduced it is likely to become less effective at tackling commuter parking. For these reasons there is a trend towards introducing permit schemes that operate 24/7. A dilution of the scheme in this way would inevitably increase the likelihood of increasing numbers of non-residents parking in the St Mary's Way area and this would be exacerbated if most of the other zones in Leighton-Linslade operated 24/7.

- b) Allowing a large number of Soulbury Road residents to obtain a permit to park in the St Mary's Way area would have the potential to significantly increase the number of cars parked in St Mary's Way particularly during evenings and weekends. Such a change is likely to reduce parking capacity for the residents of the St Mary's Way area and would be opposed by them.
 - c) The cost of permits has recently been reviewed and the first residents' permit cost reduced to £10 per annum. It was felt that the cost of second and third permits should remain unchanged at £70 and £90 respectively to act as a disincentive to multiple car ownership. These costs are seen as reasonable for all drivers and a further reduction would be unsustainable. Re-usable visitor permits do provide more flexibility and would probably be cheaper for residents, but are more open to abuse as they could be given or sold to non-residents.
 - d) If single roads were removed in isolation from the scheme it is likely that commuters would move back into those particular streets, thereby re-creating the original parking issues.
 - e) If the proposed short-stay permit-free parking was extended for a longer period than the proposed 2 hours this would increase the scope for non-residents, such as shoppers, to park there. It is felt that the 2 hour amendment is reasonable and offers residents and their visitors a significant concession in terms of being able to park permit free.
9. The main points of objection relating to Faulkner's Way are included in Appendix C and are summarised below:-
- a) The current scheme is working well and there is no need to change it. Most properties have sufficient off-road parking, particularly at the lower end of Faulkner's Way, so the 2 hour limit is not needed.
 - b) The proposed 2 hour permit-free change will be difficult to understand and enforce. There is unlikely to be sufficient enforcement patrols overnight and at the weekend to properly manage it.
 - c) If implemented the change would probably increase the number of cars parked on the hill, which can cause an obstruction.
 - d) Allocate and mark out individual spaces within the parking bays.
 - e) The residents of Stoke Road consider that it is unreasonable to charge for parking permits and do not feel that the scheme should operate 24/7, which is particularly restrictive on visitors.
10. The Highways team's response to the individual representations raised in paragraph 9 are as follows:-
- a) In most respects this is true and has successfully resolved virtually all of the concerns about commuter parking. However, the Council has proposed the 2 hour permit-free parking as a response to reasonable concerns expressed by some residents.

- b) Revised traffic signs will make it clear to drivers what the restrictions are. The 2 hour limit will undoubtedly create a greater enforcement burden, but not unacceptably so.
- c) It is felt that the proposed amendment would not significantly increase the number of cars parked on the hill. It is likely that many of the cars previously parked there belonged to commuters, who are no longer able to park there.
- d) The allocation of individual parking spaces would not conform with regulations governing highway signage and in any event would be inflexible in terms of maximising the available space.
- e) It is understandable that residents of Stoke Road are resistant to the principle of having to pay to park near their homes. However, in common with residents of all of the permit schemes in the town, if they wish to park within the restricted they will need to purchase a permit. The cost of residents' permits is seen as reasonable and in line with other authorities. The £10 first permit cost, in particular, is seen as very cheap when considered alongside other motoring costs. A permit parking zone operational for a shorter period would increase the possibility of non-residents parking there, both during the week and at weekends. There is a trend towards permit schemes operating on a full-time basis and any that operate for shorter period are likely to suffer from more non-resident parking.

St Mary's Way Zone Petition

11. A petition signed by 101 residents of St Mary's Way, Beech Grove, Hawthorn Close and Cherry Tree Walk was received in October 2013. This was received before the proposed amendments were published, so relates to the original scheme. It was decided that consideration of the petition would be deferred from the Traffic Management Meeting held on 21 November 2013 to enable it to be heard in Dunstable and alongside the outcome of the consultation on the proposed scheme amendments. The petition and covering letter are included in Appendix D.
12. The main points raised in the St Mary's Way area petition are as follows:-
 - a) Residents wish to object to the newly introduced scheme which they consider is a stealth 'visitor tax' because any visitor who wishes to park on-street would need to display a permit.
 - b) Residents were not adequately informed of the visitors permit charge before the scheme was introduced.
 - c) The Council's intention was to address indiscriminate parking by non-residents, but the scheme discriminates against those residents who wish to receive visitors but have no off-road parking available. It is the residents who are bearing the costs, rather than those creating the parking problems.
 - d) Residents are allowed to purchase only 3 books of 25 visitor permit per year which is inadequate for those who receive regular and essential visitors.

- e) The cost of permits for those households with multiple cars is unacceptably high.
 - f) The present scheme should cease with immediate effect and a new proposal be brought forward.
13. The Highways team's response to the points raised in the St Mary's Way petition in paragraph 12 are as follows:-
- a) It is considered that residents were given adequate opportunity to consider and comment on the proposals. A preliminary consultation with returnable questionnaire was followed by a formal consultation, both of which provided a chance for local people to have their say.
 - b) The aforementioned consultation leaflet explained the cost for both residents' and visitor permits. However, it is accepted that the cost of visitor permits could represent a significant financial burden for those residents without off-road parking who have regular visitors. The published amendment allowing 2 hour permit-free parking, if implemented, would help.
 - c) It is an unfortunate fact that with any scheme to tackle commuter parking it is the residents that have to bear much of the cost and inconvenience. Unfortunately, if residents wish to 're-claim' their streets, there is a cost to bear.
 - d) The limit on visitor book numbers is common across all the Council's permit schemes, so any change would require any authority-wide revision. The Council's records show that it is very rare for residents to purchase more than one book of visitor permits per year, so it is unlikely that this would make a significant difference. Changes to the permit scheme rules have been introduced which allow carers to apply for a free parking permit, providing that they can demonstrate regular attendance at a household within the permit zone. The proposal to allow any vehicle to be parked for up to 2 hours permit-free should also go a long way to addressing concerns about the cost and limit on the number of visitors permits.
 - e) The Council took the decision to reduce the cost of the first permit from £50 per year to £10 per year. This was partly due to the reduced administration costs of web-based 'virtual permits' but also a genuine desire to reduce the financial burden on residents. It was decided to retain the cost of second and third permits at £70 and £90 per annum respectively. This is seen as a deterrent to multiple car ownership in urban areas and is not considered to be an unreasonable cost when spread over a year and compared to other motoring costs. There would appear to be no justification for undertaking a further review of the Council on-street parking permit charges at this time.
 - f) It is felt that residents were adequately consulted on the current scheme and that it has been correctly and legally implemented. There would appear to be no good reason to abandon the scheme at this early stage. The published amendment is felt to be a sensible response to the concerns raised by residents.

Faulkner' Way Submission

14. The results of a locally-organised consultation on the permit parking scheme in Faulkner's Way has been received by Central Bedfordshire Council. This submission, including the comments of individual residents, is included in Appendix E. This was received at the same time as the public notices for the proposed scheme amendments was published, so makes some references to those proposals.
15. The main points raised in the Faulkner's Way submission are as follows:-
 - a) Of the 19 resident responses received, 14 favoured a review of the permit scheme and 5 said leave it as it is.
 - b) The scheme should be modified, so that it only operates during the normal working day, such as 9am-5pm from Monday to Friday, or a single yellow line restriction.
 - c) The residents did not ask for 2 hour permit-free parking, although it is suggested that this would help.
 - d) More double yellow lines are needed to address parking on the hill.
 - e) Residents want dialogue with the Council about addressing the shortage of off-road parking at the top of Faulkner's Way.
16. The Highways team's response to the points raised in the Faulkner's Way petition in paragraph 15 are as follows:-
 - a) It is acknowledged that a majority of those that replied would like to see some change to the current scheme. However, there are 37 households in Faulkner's Way and it is impossible to determine the views of those who did not respond.
 - b) It is entirely possible to have residents permit parking schemes that operate for less than 24/7, i.e. during the working day only. However, in some existing permit zones the Council has received complaints about non-resident parking during the evening and weekend. Residents find it frustrating that having purchased a permit they are unable to find a parking space at the very time they need it. Also, increasing numbers of people work outside of the traditional Monday to Friday 9-5 working day, so if the scheme was reduced residents might suffer from non-resident parking. For these reasons there is a trend towards introducing permit schemes that operate 24/7. A dilution of the scheme in this way would inevitably increase the likelihood of increasing numbers of non-residents parking in Faulkner's Way and this would be exacerbated if most of the other zones in Leighton-Linslade operate 24/7. A single yellow line restriction would not be practical in the first part of Faulkner's Way where there are parking bays because drivers would be required to move their vehicles to a less desirable location at least once per day. A permit scheme is a better option as it allows permit holders to park in the lay-bys without having to move their cars.

- c) The proposed 2 hour permit-free parking amendment would help address residents' concerns about short stay visitors and would give the residents themselves more freedom to park on-street.
- d) It is felt that the proposed amendment would not significantly increase the number of cars parked on the hill. It is likely that many of the cars previously parked there belonged to commuters, who are no longer able to park there. There is a reluctance to impose excessive double yellow lines in residential streets, which in this case would reduce the available kerb side space for permit holders.
- e) There would appear to be little scope to provide additional off-road parking in Faulkner's and, in any event, the provision of off-road parking in residential streets is not a priority for Council funding. The immediate priority is to tackle on-street parking.

Conclusions

- 17. Many of the comments received, both in direct response to the published scheme amendments and those in the other two submissions, relate to the general principles of the permit parking schemes. Perhaps the main issue being opposition to a permit scheme that operates on a full time basis, when local people feel that it would work equally well if it only applied during the working day only.
- 18. There have in fact been relatively few comments directly related to the published proposals which are to allow 2 hour permit-free parking and to include a small number of residencies to the Faulkner's Way scheme. In fact most of the individual replies from Faulkner's Way consider that the current scheme is working well and they want no change.
- 19. Allowing a period of permit-free parking is a very common element of many permit parking schemes and experience suggest that it works well. Two hours is generally sufficient for visits by family, friends and tradesmen. For longer stays, visitor permits, carer permits and other dispensations are available. In Faulkner's Way some visitors will be able to park off-road because many homes have ample off-road parking. In the St Mary's Way area, there is unrestricted kerbside parking available within a fairly short walking distance. It is felt that the proposals to amend the scheme are a sensible solution to the concerns raised by residents, but will not bring about any undesirable effects, such as those suggested by those opposed to the 2 hour permit-free parking. A possible issue with 2 hour permit-free parking is that it allows free short-stay parking for non-residents, but this is normally only a problem in roads that are located close to town centres. The St Mary's Way area and Faulkner's Way are far enough away from the shops for this not to be an issue.
- 20. It also seems reasonable to proceed with the extension of the Faulkner's Way zone to include the properties in Stoke Road. It is acknowledged that there is resistance to the principle of paying to park on-road. However, like all residents in permit parking zones, the Stoke Road residents will have to meet the cost of a permit if they wish to park within the zone. It would not be appropriate for the Council to waive or reduce the permit charge for those particular residents.

21. In summary it is recommended that the proposed amendments to the existing permit parking schemes in Faulkners Way and the St Mary's Way area go ahead as published.
22. If approved, it is anticipated that the amendments would be implemented within the next three months.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Public Notice of Proposed Permit Parking Scheme Amendments

Appendix B – Individual Objections from St Mary's Way Area

Appendix C – Individual Objections and Representations from Faulkner's Way

Appendix D – St Mary's Way Area Petition covering letter

Appendix E – Faulkner' Way Submission



PUBLIC NOTICE

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL PROPOSES TO AMEND THE EXISTING RESIDENTS' PERMIT PARKING ZONES IN FAULKNER'S WAY AND ST. MARY'S WAY AREA, LEIGHTON BUZZARD

Reason for proposal: The proposed Order is considered necessary to improve parking facilities for residents. It is proposed to amend the residents' permit parking schemes in Faulkner's Way and the St Mary's Way area to allow vehicles to be parked for up to 2 hours without a permit. In addition, it is proposed to add a length of Stoke Road to the Faulkner's Way zone and allow specified residents of Stoke Road and their visitors to purchase a permit to park in the new extended zone. Faulkner's Way residents would also be able to park in the proposed Stoke Road permit parking spaces.

Effect of the Order:

To amend the current Residents' Permit Holders only parking to 2 hour Limited Waiting with No Return in 2 hours, except Permit Holders, on the following lengths of road in Leighton Buzzard:-

Faulkner's Way	From a point approximately 12 metres east of the rear of the footway on Stoke Road for its full length, with the exception of those lengths covered by No Waiting at any time.
St Mary's Way	From a point approximately 10 metres south of the property boundary of no.62 Soulbury Road and no.1a St Mary's Way extending in a northerly direction to a point approximately 13 metres north of the property boundary of nos.41 and 43 St Mary's Way.
Beech Grove	For its full length.
Hawthorn Close	For its full length.

To add the following length of road in Leighton Buzzard to the amended Faulkner's Way Residents' Permit Parking zone:-

Stoke Road	East side, from a point in line with the boundary of nos.5 and 7 Faulkner's Way extending in a southerly direction to a point in line with the boundary of nos.3 and 5 Stoke Road.
------------	--

To add the following residential properties to the amended Faulkner's Way Residents' Permit Parking zone:-

Stoke Road	Property nos.1 to 15 inclusive.
------------	---------------------------------

Further Details may be examined during normal opening hours at Leighton Buzzard Library, Lake Street, Leighton Buzzard LU7 1RX or online at www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicstatutorynotices. These details will be placed on deposit until 6 weeks after the Order is made or until it is decided not to continue with the proposal.

Objections: should be sent in writing to the Transportation Manager, Bedfordshire Highways, Woodlands Annex, Manton Lane, Bedford MK41 7NU or e-mail centralbedsconsultation@amey.co.uk stating the grounds on which they are made by 13 December 2013.

Order Title: If made will be "Central Bedfordshire Council (Bedfordshire County Council (District of South Bedfordshire) (Civil Enforcement Area and Special Enforcement Area) (Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2008) (Variation No.*) Order 201**"

Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House
Chicksands
Shefford SG1917 5TQ

Marcel Coiffait
Director of Community Services

19 November 2013

Appendix B – Individual Objections from St Mary’s Way Area

I am writing to object to the changes proposed to the parking permit scheme in St Mary's Way, Beech Grove and Hawthorn Close for the following reasons:

1. the proposed relaxation of parking restrictions to 2 hours with no return in 2 hours does not go far enough;
2. residents on Soulbury Road remain unable to apply for parking permits despite their having used St Mary's Way as a safe overflow area for parking for many years.

Duration of the Parking Restriction

The purported reason for introducing the permit parking scheme was :

- To improve highway safety, facilitate the free flow of traffic and improve the amenity of streets for residents

The underlying reason was that increasing numbers of commuters were parking in the area and the Council wished to deter them.

Despite this, and despite formal objections from elderly residents without cars who receive many visitors, the Council promoted and implemented a scheme which applied 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with all visitors who wished to park being required to use visitor permits.

Department for Transport guidance to local authorities before taking on Civil Parking Enforcement says:

E34. The local authority will need to consider whether restrictions should apply beyond the normal working day and/or at weekends. The authority should examine the scope for relaxing or removing any redundant parking controls. Unnecessary restrictions are very quickly identified when the authority takes over responsibility for their enforcement and this can result in complaints from motorists and bad publicity. The proposed change makes it possible for residents to receive visitors for up to 2 hours without charge. However, they would still need to use a visitor permit for visits of more than 2 hours, even at weekends when commuter parking is not an issue. Commuters would be equally deterred by a fixed 2-hour restriction on weekdays (e.g. 10:00 - 12:00 Monday - Friday), which would allow residents to receive visitors without charge at all other times. As the period 10:00 - 12:00 is longer than the standard 10:00 - 11:00 used elsewhere, it provides the opportunity for parking attendants to visit the road immediately after visiting Leopold Road but outside the peak period for checking alternating morning/afternoon restrictions. If such a scheme were coupled with a small bay where a different restriction applied, it would then be possible for residents to receive visitors at any time without charge. This is particularly important for the elderly residents without cars, whose quality of life often depends on receiving visitors, many almost as elderly as themselves.

I ask the Council to change the parking restriction to a period of 2 hours during the working day, Monday - Friday, with no further restriction. If the Council declines to do this, I ask that the restriction be the same as that in Springfield Road (which is considerably closer to the railway station): 2 hours with no return within 2 hours during the period 8 a.m. - 5 p.m. Monday - Friday.

Exclusion of Soulbury Road Residents

The entire length of Soulbury Road between the railway bridge and St Mary's Way is covered by double yellow lines and the zig-zag lines of a puffin crossing. Parking on the road is therefore illegal. Although there is a grass verge on the North side of Soulbury Road, by the Road Traffic Regulation Act this is subject to the same restrictions as the carriageway, so cannot legally be used for parking. West of St Mary's Way, there are no road markings on Soulbury Road to restrict parking but the road is a bare two lanes' width and any on-road parking prevents oncoming vehicles from passing each other.

Given the narrowness of Soulbury Road, residents (myself included) have for many years used St Mary's Way as an "overflow" area in which to park. The conversion of St Mary's Way to a permit parking area together with the introduction of double yellow lines at the bottom of St Mary's Way therefore leaves us with few legal options to park. It is no surprise to me that parking has increased substantially on Soulbury Road west of St Mary's Way. This is, of course, a danger to other roads users, hinders the free flow of traffic and reduces the amenity of the area to residents. In short, the permit parking scheme has had effects diametrically opposite to those it was supposed to achieve.

Despite the fact that we would be affected by the proposed scheme, the residents of Soulbury Road were not consulted or even notified of it before it was introduced. No doubt the statutory notices were placed in the local newspaper; but I do not take it every week. I do, however, walk up St Mary's Way at least three different days of the week and never saw a notice about the proposed scheme fixed to a lamp-post or other street furniture. I happened to discover about the scheme by accident after the period for lodging objections had closed but before the Traffic Management Meeting which considered the proposal and wrote to Gary Baldwin at Bedfordshire Highways making objections. I wish those objections to be taken into account now.

I ask the Council to amend the scheme to recognise the use by residents of Soulbury Road of St Mary's Way as an "overflow" parking area and achieve the stated aims of the scheme by:

1. bringing the start of the permit parking area closer to Soulbury Road to enable more cars to be parked lawfully;
2. including more houses on Soulbury Road (including mine) in the zone where residents can buy permits.

I am writing in response to the public notice dated 19 November 2013 where I am invited to make any objections or specific comments on the proposed amendment to the residential parking scheme currently in force in Hawthorn Close and, I must say, it is nice to be well enough to do so this time since I was not able to respond to the initial consultation for the scheme. I would like first to illustrate the negative impact the scheme has already had on me and in order to do this I must state that I have a medical diagnosis of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. Since I refuse to buy into a scheme which has effectively been forced upon me and do not wish to receive daily parking tickets I find I must now park in a location some eighty yards or so from my home. On average I make two journeys a day by car which means I am required to walk approximately 320 yards a day for the privilege of doing so. A key side effect of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome is muscle ache, a symptom I suffer from daily, and this enforced unwelcome addition to my journeys is a constant physical and mental irritant and I would go so far as to say that it negatively impacts my quality of life.

Another reason I refuse to buy into the scheme is that I simply cannot afford to, I left university in 2008 and since then have only been able to secure voluntary work. By the time I have paid my keep and put fuel in my car I am lucky to break even at the end of the month. I could perhaps afford the £10 charge for the initial household permit but am not prepared to place the remainder of my family, also of limited financial means, in the position of having to pay a greater amount and I certainly could not afford a book of visitor parking permits.

The proposed amendment to the scheme would certainly have positive points, my aging grandparents would be able to visit without having to park an uncomfortable distance away (although, of course, they would only be able to visit for two hours at a time) and I find it quite ludicrous that my grandmother, as a blue badge holder, is able to park on double yellow lines in a town center for three hours yet cannot park outside the family home at all as the scheme stands and for a mere two hours under the proposed amendment. Under such circumstances it is no surprise to me that I do not qualify for concessionary charges despite my physical and financial difficulties. The proposed amendment would also mean that I would no longer have to

put myself in quite a sizeable amount of pain by carrying some of heavy equipment I frequently require for my voluntary work over what becomes under such circumstances a very great distance indeed. I still find the proposed amendment objectionable though, the duration of two hours is not long enough and I cannot support a scheme in any form wherein elderly residents could find themselves having to pay charges to receive visitors. All this could so easily be solved by the introduction of a single, reusable visitors permit, at least then residents would be able to receive one car full of visitors at a time and could enjoy their visit without having to clock watch.

It is my firm view that a better course of action would be to abolish the scheme altogether, at least in Hawthorn Close, where it is neither wanted nor necessary. In this way we would not have the unpleasant site of uniformed parking attendants patrolling the area, the street would look as if it was lived in again and we would not be penalised for being too poor to afford a driveway.

DEAR SIR/MADAM,
THANK YOU FOR NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO OUR PARKING RESTRICTIONS. I HAVE CONSIDERED THEM WITH SOME CONSTERNATION. WITH A VIEW THAT THIS COUNTRY WILL NOT INTERFERE WITH OUR CIVIL RIGHTS & FREEDOM OF SPEECH, HAVING BEEN INVOLVED WITH THE PETITION YOU RECENTLY RECEIVED, AND DISCUSSION WITH MR BOWIE. I THINK A COMPLETE RETHINK ON THE PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN THIS SMALL AREA, IT WASN'T EVEN AN OPEN DISCUSSION OR ADVISING CAPACITY YOU OFFER US, YOU BROUGHT THESE RESTRICTIONS IN WITHOUT EVEN ADVISING THE RESIDENTS AS TO WHEN IT WOULD START (BY DATE) OFFICIALLY.
I THOUGHT THIS WOULD HAVE BEEN A JOINT PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN US THE PUBLIC & YOU OUR REPRESENTATIVES.
AS OUR AREA WAS BLIGHTED WITH COMMUTERS AND ALSO THE DENTAL PRACTICE EMPLOYEES & PATIENTS & REPS. THIS PRACTICE IS IN SOULBURY ROAD.
WE WANTED YOUR ADVICE NOT YOUR STALINIST RESPONSE AND HINDERENCE IN TELLING US HOW MANY CARS (PER HOUSEHOLD) WE CAN HAVE AND WHO WE CAN & CAN'T

HAVE AS OUR VISITORS I.E. OUR FRIENDS,
RELATIONS AND PEOPLE WHO SUPPLY THEIR
SERVICES TO US (AS SOME OF US ARE NOW
PRIVATELY OWNED & LESSEES).

YOU NOW OFFER US ALTERNATIVES THAT
ARE NEGATIVE OFFERS AND STILL SHACKLE
US. A NO 7 C.T.W.

~~WE~~ WE, OURSELVES HAVE THE MAJORITY OF
RELATIVES WHO LIVE OUTSIDE OF OUR AREA.

WHEN THEY TRAVEL TO SEE US OR STAY WITH
US, IT IS WITH RESTRICTIONS ON US.

8 HOURS. YOU HAVE TO BE JOKING. UP TO
3 BOOKS OF 25 ONE DAY PARKING PERMITS
+ EXTRA (IF EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES APPLY
NO I'M SORRY WE NEED TO SIT DOWN -
AND DISCUSS IT WITH REPRESENTATIVE FROM
EACH UNIT IN THIS AREA I.E. ST MARYS WAY,
BEECH GROVE & HAWTHORN CLOSE.

COMMUNICATION IS THE NAME SO PLEASE
START COMMUNICATING WITH US NOW.

With regards to the proposed changes to the parking regulation changes in the St Marys Way/Beech Grove area. May i raise my objection to this change, not that i disapprove to the relaxation but because this change does not go far enough.

The reason the parking restrictions were brought in was to "control commuter parking" this is welcome. However the current parking restrictions run 24 hours a day 7 days a week. This is quite ridiculous, as "commuter parking" has never been a problem over the weekend, especially at 11pm on a Sunday evening, yet the parking restrictions cover these times. Why?

Also looking at the area surrounding the railway station in Linslade, 85% of the roads have parking restrictions that run Monday to Friday with either a single yellow line restricting parking for an hours at a specific time; or like on Springfield Road, have residence permit parking. However the big difference is that in Springfield Road the parking restrictions run from 8am to 5pm Monday to Friday, also with 2 hours parking no return in 2 hours.

Why are the parking restrictions currently in place than St Marys Way and Beech Grove deemed necessary to run 24 hours 7 days a week when the council have placed less arduous parking controls in roads closer to the station? Why not have the same restrictions as Springfield Road, as this will control the "commuter parking" problem, whilst not affecting the residence of the St Marys Road and Beech Grove or their legitimate visitors?

I trust these points will be considered and another consultation be made to the residents of the area.

Appendix C – Individual Objections and Representations from Faulkner’s Way

We would like to object to the proposed changes to parking restrictions on Faulkners Way. The current permit scheme was introduced at the end of August 2013, following public consultation and ballot. In our opinion and those of others on Faulkners Way the new scheme is working well in alleviating the parking problems that have escalated in recent years.

Recently, a lobby group led by Xxxx Xxxxx has mailed every resident on the road with a self-styled letter and ballot paper urging everyone to change the present scheme as it does not suit their particular lifestyle preferences. The members of this lobby group all have double garages they choose not to use for parking cars and have large driveways. They each keep between 2 and 4 vehicles.

We found their letter to be inaccurate in its claims (referring to the parking problem as “alleged” and not real, which it is) and sensational in its presentation (Colour images of parking wardens and tickets taken from the internet), raising the prospect of dire consequences of the new “regime” for all residents and their visitors. The tone was intimidating in its presumption that everyone should be unhappy with the present scheme and alarmist in promoting its message.

Despite this lobby group not having any mandate to represent the residents of Faulkners Way, we duly completed and returned our “ballot form” to Mr Xxxxx together with a polite letter expressing our views. We have received no reply. No-one knows what the result of this unconstitutional ballot was and those of us who did not support the proposed change are left wondering if our votes were even considered given the ballot was conducted secretly by a lobby group whom do not share our views. Nevertheless, it appears from the notice that has now been posted on lampposts in the street that you have bowed to the pressure of this group.

Surely, if anything has to change then the ballot should be conducted independently, openly and in a balanced and objective way by yourselves, not by a self-interest group? Otherwise, you are giving a license to everyone who does not agree with the result of a fair and legitimate ballot to challenge it in order to serve their own interests.

As for the proposed scheme, it is far too complicated and unwieldy. We cannot envisage how it can be communicated clearly to those looking to park, nor how wardens will monitor it without continuous patrols. You are proposing to replace a very clear and effective scheme with a very convoluted alternative. With winter approaching, the prospect of the E-W hill up to Stoke Road returning to a parking lot is a nightmare prospect.

Further to your letter of 18th November 2013 concerning the proposed residents' permit parking scheme amendments, we are writing to lodge our objections.

The permit parking scheme, introduced in August of this year, has had the desired effect as there has been a significant reduction in the number of vehicles parking in Faulkners Way and in particular on the hill immediately east of Bossington Lane. In icy conditions the road is extremely hazardous when driving up the hill with cars parked alongside.

Currently the scheme works very well. The proposed amendment allowing on-street parking for up to 2 hours without a permit cannot in our view be properly managed and controlled. If the parking scheme is to operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week as stated then warden patrols will be required to visit Faulkners Way every 2 hours throughout that period. Clearly this will not be the case and in that event people will soon be emboldened sufficiently to start parking in Faulkners Way again. We see no logical reason why the current scheme, which is working very satisfactorily, should be changed.

In point 2 of your letter you refer to residents expressing concerns about the current scheme, presumably subsequent to its introduction and it is as a result of these concerns that you now

propose the amendments. We are aware of some residents being unhappy with the scheme since its introduction as they wrote to every household encouraging us to support them in making changes and included a 'ballot paper'. We have however heard nothing of the ballot result since. Our concern is that the proposed amendments have been brought about as a result of the above, which we consider to be totally undemocratic. They have no mandate to speak on behalf of the Faulkners Way residents.

We have lived in Faulkners Way for over 20 years, much longer than the unhappy residents referred to above, and have seen the build up of cars parking in Faulkners Way, particularly by those going to the station. Until the new permit parking scheme got underway it was becoming increasingly difficult to safely drive up the road, particularly in winter.

The existing permit parking scheme works well. Do not change it.

Dear Sirs, I have several objections to this proposal as it concerns Faulkners Way.

1) The current scheme came into force in the summer of 2013 after a lengthy period of consultation with all residents. This amendment appears to have been proposed without the consultation of residents (certainly not me) and merely a one page notice being pinned to a lamppost. I object on the basis that residents have not been consulted which is inconsistent with the original plan.

2) You state "the proposed order is considered necessary to improve parking facilities for residents" The residents of Faulkners Way do not benefit from these changes for the following reasons:

Residents of Stoke Road and their visitors can now purchase permits to allow them to park in Faulkners Way. This not only increases the total number of vehicles parking in Faulkners Way but it is likely these vehicles from Stoke Road will park in the Faulkners Way spaces closest to Stoke Road. These spaces are outside houses that do not have drives therefore the Stoke vehicles will take their spaces forcing them to park in other less convenient areas. The additional spaces in Stoke Road would not be available for if they were, the Stoke vehicles would not need to park in Faulkners Way in the first place. These disturbed Faulkners vehicles would then park further down Faulkners Way. This does not benefit Faulkners residents but disadvantages them.

3) You are also proposing allowing any vehicle to park in Faulkners Way for up to two hours without a permit. Once again this potentially increases the overall number of vehicles in Faulkners Way. With the exception of the houses at the top (Stoke Road end) of Faulkners Way that were mentioned above, all other houses have a double garage and a drive capable of allowing parking for at least two further vehicles. In addition the current scheme provides for the on street parking of additional vehicles for residents through the purchase of a £10 permit. That's five Resident or guest vehicles can thus be accommodated on residents drives &/or garages or additional vehicles via a £30 book of 25 guests passes. Clearly the 2 hour parking is not necessary for residents of Faulkners Way and their guests.

It must therefore be assumed that you anticipate demand for short term parking in Faulkners Way from people from areas outside of Faulkners Way.

This will mean we are back where we started with cars parked in dangerous and inconvenient positions, hardly "improving parking conditions for residents".

Before the original scheme, cars were parked below the new double yellow lines going down the hill, often on the apex of the corner turning right or south such that vehicles coming from Numbers 15,17,19,21 & 23 would not be able to see up the hill and view vehicles coming down it. This situation was made even more dangerous in icy conditions with a blind corner and a hill to negotiate. Also if vehicles were parked either side of Faulkners Way not enough room would be provided for emergency services vehicle access. If you consider there is only limited demand for outside 2 hour parking, then surely an amendment is not necessary.

4) Should you nevertheless decide to go ahead with this ridiculous amendment the question remains how would it be enforced. A warden would not only need to check on permits but need to patrol on an hourly basis, noting registration numbers, in order to enforce the 2 hour limit,

otherwise the whole scheme would have been pointless. Seems like an unnecessary expense to me.

The current scheme works and has resulted in a safe street allowing ready access to delivery and emergency service vehicles, allowing the majority of houses to park their cars and accommodate guests in their garages, drives and via an inexpensive permit scheme. The vehicles from the remaining houses can at least park outside their houses.

I object to this amended scheme for the above reasons and because it is unnecessary "to improve parking facilities for residents"

Indeed it would only be safe to amend it as proposed if addition double yellow lines were incorporated on the apex of the corners, right and left before Faulkners Way splits and double yellow lines on one side of the street to ensure vehicles are not parked on both sides, to ensure delivery and emergency service vehicle access. Hardly seems worth the effort. Why don't you just leave it as it is.

You will, no doubt, recall that we exchanged correspondence earlier this year both prior to and subsequent to the new parking permit scheme being introduced in Faulkners Way, Leighton Buzzard. I have now received a copy of the notice dated 18 November 2013 regarding the proposed amendments to the scheme and, as you would probably expect, I have a few comments on these, as follows:

As a general comment, I really feel that this whole episode of introducing a parking scheme in Faulkners Way, has been a bit of a disaster. I appreciate, that in bringing in arrangements such as these will never please everyone, but I do feel that what began as an attempt to stop the annoyance to residents of commuters parking in Faulkners Way AND stop dangerous parking on the FW hill, has simply created a scheme that is a far worse annoyance to the majority of residents.

Taking point 2 of the notice first, I accept that the introduction of a fee-free parking period of 2 hours on street, does provide some help. But, I'm afraid this doesn't go far enough AND I really can't see how this will be properly monitored on an efficient basis, including cost efficiency. Surely the 2 hours can only start when a warden first sees the car (which could have already been there for some time); how often is it going to be necessary for wardens to visit the road to then check back? From the soundings that have been taken in the street, the majority would prefer the parking scheme to only operate on a Monday to Friday basis, say from 8 am til 6 pm. I recall that you have previously made the point that travellers using the station, are likely to park at weekends as well as weekdays and this is why you made the scheme 24/7. However, if you really believed this to be the case, then why does the Harcourt Close scheme NOT also operate on a 24/7 basis? Having lived in FW for nearly 20 years, I can only ever remember the odd vehicle parking on the hill during evenings/weekends. I stand by the view that I would MUCH prefer the scheme **NOT** to apply at evenings and weekends.

Turning to point 1 of the notice, whilst I can understand the parking problem experienced by the residents of 1-15 Stoke Road, from the soundings taken in the street, it seems that the use of FW to park, by Stoke Road residents was as much of a problem to the FW residents at the top of the hill, as parking by commuters themselves. If the proposed change comes in as suggested, I can see these FW residents being upset AND, more importantly, I suspect that parking on the hill itself will rear its ugly head again. This is particularly so, if the inset parking bays in FW and Stoke Road provide insufficient spaces for the cars of the residents concerned. Perhaps there might be some merit in the Council liaising with the residents concerned to see how many vehicles might be involved. It is not my place to comment on behalf of other residents but I suspect you may well hear back on this basis.

If we assume that there is insufficient space in the inset parking bays for all vehicles involved, then as I said above, this will almost certainly see vehicles parking back on the hill itself again with all the dangers that involves. This could be solved by extending the double yellow lines all the way down the hill. However, there is a real danger here for us residents at the bottom of the hill, in that the excess parking will simply migrate down to where we are!! As you will appreciate, we would not want this to occur, principally on a safety basis.

What to suggest then? Well to be honest, I don't think there is a solution that will suit everyone. The FW residents at the top of the hill probably won't like the proposal to allow Stoke Road residents to park in FW, but where should they park instead? The Stoke Road residents involved deserve to have available

parking spaces as much as everyone else, but we really don't want them parking on the hill itself or creeping down the bottom of the hill.

A couple of thoughts that could help here:

- I believe that the inset parking bays on the south side of FW and in Stoke Road could be marked out with 'car length' parking spaces to improve parking efficiency, i.e. to avoid cars currently parking inconsiderately and taking up too much space;
- Are the inset parking bays only available to be used by the Stoke Road residents themselves (plus FW residents under this proposal)? If not, they should be;
- It looks as though a number of vehicles have started parking in the entrance of Bossington Lane from FW, i.e. beyond the extent of the double yellow lines. I believe that Bossington Lane is unadopted, but it seems to me that there is a significant amount of usable space here, at least from the end of the double yellow lines up to where the entrance is to the garages at the back of the FW houses. There is enough space on either side of this part of the lane to create a significant number of parking bays, particularly if the existing foliage is removed on one side of the road. I think this could create a significant number of additional permit spaces to help overcome the problem.

We cannot understand the logic behind these amendments. What is needed is a professional survey and report into the parking facilities for Stoke Road residents and the dangerous parking on the EW slope of Faulkners Way. Our POINTS ARE ;-

1 Why would Faulkners Way residents even consider parking in the bay in Stoke road? This bay should be properly marked with individual parking bays and a place allotted to the residents of Stoke Road on the opposite side of the road with no parking facilities. (we are unsure if this should include the houses by the traffic lights.) The house nos should be painted on the bays. There is no need for anyone else to park as Yirells has its own carpark and Tesco can be used for Dillamores Funeral clients.

2 The parking bays on the slope of Faulkners Way should be similarly marked, with proper allocated parking bays. Car should NOT be allowed to park at a diagonal angle with their back wheels and boots sticking out into the road at the top of Faulkners Way, causing a dangerous hazard near a main junction. Since the Stoke Road residents (we were led to believe commuters) have not been allowed to park on the EW slope we have not suffered any near head on collisions. This slope should have the double yellow lines extended to its base, as there is a blind spot as we drive up to the slope then have to swerve out to miss the parked cars into the pathway of the oncoming cars who also have swerved out to miss the parked cars jutting out of the bay.

3 The houses at the top of Faulkners Way all have garages. Three in Bossington Lane have been changed into offices for The Elms Old Peoples Home. This means the garage doors are now defunct so the brambles can be cleared and three more parking bays can be made. There is also more scope for parking spaces in this area.

4 The thought that your daughters, sons and their families have the expense of travelling to visit only to be allowed 2 hours parking is ridiculous. As residents we sweep the road and paths from the fallen leaves, we should not be expected to pay for our visitors parking.

Ref: Faulkner's Way Parking Permit Zone

We write in response to your letter dated 18th November, in regard to the proposed residents permit parking scheme amendments to express our objections to certain proposals.

We can fully understand the frustration felt by Stoke Road residents in their effort to park outside their own home's as we had this for the 10 years we have lived in Faulkner's Way. It is only now since the parking permit zone has come into force that we can actually be 100% certain of a parking space.

We therefore, have no objection to residents of Stoke Road numbers 1-15 applying for parking permits for Faulkner's Way, although both Number 1 and Number 15 do have allocated parking on their drives anyway.

Visitors Parking – your letter mentions some concerns from residents about this... I bet you these are not from the residents truly affected by the lack of parking space, i.e. Number's 1-18.

We all received a letter recently asking our views on this matter and attached was a petition, the letter came from a few residents at the bottom of the road. They stated "it was inconvenient" to have to move their cars from their drives to allow visitors to park. (Some of the houses listed on the letter have parking on the drive for at least 3 cars – whereas we have none!).

We do therefore, object to the proposal to allow 2 hour parking without a permit for the following reasons:-

- How is this to be monitored? At the weekend there were at least 4 car's in the lay-by at the top of Faulkner's Way, that are not registered, some from Stoke Road, others visiting the nursing home, they were there for a lot longer than 2 hours. Where was the warden?
- Whilst it is a nuisance to obtain visitors permits, I have paid for mine, do I get a refund?
- I feel that the original survey carried out by the council was not satisfactory, it should never have been for all of Faulkner's Way, I mean has anyone from the council actually visited the road. The houses at the top (of which we are one), will never have the same response as down the road, the needs are completely different.
- If you allow 2 hours free parking, are you guaranting it will be monitored? We will have the same problems back again, parking from Stoke Road visitors, The Elms, going into town, the Nursing Home there will be no spaces once again for the residents. If there would be a problem with monitoring, why not install parking meters that allow two hours, that way the council once again benefit from the parking fees, and us residents who have to pay for the privilege of parking outside our own homes actually get to park in a space that we have paid for!!.

As a foot note, I would like to enquiry about the monitoring of the parking as it is now. When the permits first came into force there were regular checks being carried out and several cars were delivered parking fines. I have not seen any traffic wardens for weeks and there are defiantly un-registered car's down there, unless of course that is, you have already issued Stoke Road residents with parking permits before the proposal has been confirmed.

With reference to your letter of 18th November outlining proposed changes to the street parking in Faulknors Way, we would request that parking is stopped on the hill (other than in lay-bys) as it is very dangerous driving up the hill, without adequate vision, when vehicles are parked thereon. One cannot see round the corner until too late to avoid cars coming down the hill. Yellow lines should be extended to bottom of hill.

Many thanks for your letter of 18 Nov 2013 outlining changes the above residents parking scheme.

In response to these proposals I have two issues, first based on cost and the second based on the timings of the restrictions.

In terms of cost, as there is nowhere else for residents to park other than in the restricted zone it seems unfair to ask for anything other than a nominal fee for a permit. What Central Beds Council is doing in these proposals is forcing us to buy a permit as we will have absolutely no alternative as you will be removing any free parking from the neighbourhood. This means that if these proposals go through you are simply adding an additional charge to the Council Tax that you already take, in effect a charge of £80 per year per household (as most residents here have two cars). By rights we should not be charged to park near our homes, but if you have to can I suggest that a fee of £10 per car, with no additional uplift for second vehicles would be a more fair way of resolving this.

The charge of £10 for the first car, an additional £70 for the second and £90 for the third is quite unacceptable and unfair on the many households of multiple occupancy in this area.

In terms of the timings of these restrictions there is simply no reason why they have to be enforced 24 hours a day 7 days a week and it would be ample discouragement to commuters to enforce the zone Mon to Fri 9 to 5. By doing this it gives residents' friends and relatives more flexibility and also again has a reduction to the costs you are enforcing on us, which again is only fair.

Personally I would be much happier to go back to the situation where there were no restrictions at all and feel that this has been managed quite poorly and policed in an over zealous manner, basically it has been a sledgehammer to crack a nut as there weren't any significant problems with the commuters to start with. However if this can be implemented in a more sensitive manner, with adequate information going to local residents and ensure the timings and costs are appropriate to the situation I would be happier.

I look forward to hearing the responses of other residents and Central Beds Council's reaction to these.

Many thanks for your letter of 18 Nov 2013 outlining changes the above residents parking scheme.

In response to these proposals I have two issues, first based on cost and the second based on the timings of the restrictions.

In terms of cost, as there is nowhere else for residents to park other than in the restricted zone it seems unfair to ask for anything other than a nominal fee for a permit. What Central Beds Council is doing in these proposals is forcing us to buy a permit as we will have absolutely no alternative as you will be removing any free parking from the neighbourhood. This means that if these proposals go through you are simply adding an additional charge to the Council Tax that you already take, in effect a charge of £80 per year per household (as most residents here have two cars). By rights we should not be charged to park near our homes, but if you have to can I suggest that a fee of £10 per car, with no additional uplift for second vehicles would be a more fair way of resolving this.

The charge of £10 for the first car, an additional £70 for the second and £90 for the third is quite unacceptable and unfair on the many households of multiple occupancy in this area.

In terms of the timings of these restrictions there is simply no reason why they have to be enforced 24 hours a day 7 days a week and it would be ample discouragement to commuters to enforce the zone Mon to Fri 9 to 5. By doing this it gives residents' friends and relatives more flexibility and also again has a reduction to the costs you are enforcing on us, which again is only fair.

Personally I would be much happier to go back to the situation where there were no restrictions at all and feel that this has been managed quite poorly and policed in an over zealous manner, basically it has been a sledgehammer to crack a nut as there weren't any significant problems with the commuters to start with. However if this can be implemented in a more sensitive manner, with adequate information going to local residents and ensure the timings and costs are appropriate to the situation I would be happier.

I look forward to hearing the responses of other residents and Central Beds Council's reaction to these.

In relation to your letter of 18 Nov 2013 outlining changes the above residents parking scheme, I have the following response:

Cost - The charge of £10 for the first car, an additional £70 for the second and £90 for the third is quite unacceptable and unfair on the many households of multiple occupancy in this area. There are two cars in my household, and therefore to pay £80 for the privilege of parking outside my own house, on top of the road tax and council tax I pay, seems excessive. If the charge is to justify the admin costs of implementing the parking management scheme, then I'm not sure why the cost would increase by £60 for the second car and some could argue that the council are profiteering out of residents who do not have access to off road parking. Therefore, I would be happy to pay the £10 per car, but no more than that.

Timing - If the objective of the traffic regulation order is to prevent commuters from parking in the area, then I do not understand why the current proposed timing is twenty four hours a day seven days a week. The impact of the current proposed timing will be with residents family and friends either parking on the single yellow line on Stoke Road or further up Stoke outside other residents properties, which I'm sure will lead to more complaints to the council. Therefore, I would be happy if the timings were adjusted to Mon to Fri between the hours of 10 - 4, or a two hours no return policy was put in place as is the case on Old Road.

Appendix D – St Mary's Way Area Petition covering letter

Re: Parking Controls – Various Roads, Leighton Buzzard

We the residents of the following streets: St. Mary's Way, Beach Grove, Hawthorn Close and Cherry Tree Walk, wish to state our objections to the issuing of the stealth 'visitors tax' which has been introduced in our area under the guise of a parking permit scheme. In previous correspondence to our homes this proposal was never mentioned until your letter of 1st August 2013:

'To clarify, this will mean that if you or a visitor wishes to park a vehicle on-street in St Mary's Way, Beach Grove or Hawthorn Close, you will need to apply to Central Bedfordshire Council for a permit'.

Prior notification of your intent to charge us to receive visitors to our homes, an integral part of the parking permit scheme, would have given us residents the opportunity to be in receipt of the full facts of the scheme before choosing any possible action. We find your actions of informing us of this charge 'through the back door' totally unacceptable and we cannot support this taxation as a part of any parking scheme.

In your letter to us, 19th February 2013, again there is no mention in the Public Notice of your intent to impose charges for visitor parking. You do however mention the following:

'The residents permit parking zone is intended to address indiscriminate all-day parking by non-residents in this area of Leighton Buzzard'

If your intention is to address indiscriminate acts towards our households by non residents what then is your reason behind your own discriminatory actions behind the entire scheme? Residents who are unable to accommodate visitors to their homes for free, due to a lack of off-road parking, will be charged when their neighbours with facilities won't. Surely this action in itself discriminates?

For example in Hawthorn Close, living two doors apart are two senior residents, both are widows, pensioners and unable to drive. Both rely on visitors to help them with essentials such as shopping, doctors, hospital appointments etc. Visitors also tend their gardens for them and offer general help and well being through their visits. There is

however one difference between them - one has a drive whilst the other does not. As a result of your discriminatory actions one will be expected to pay for these essential and life enhancing visits from their pension whilst the other does not. To then state on the council website each home will be **allowed** a maximum of three visitor books per year, especially when many households including the elderly, have stated they could easily use a book a month, is surely against our basic human rights? For those who cannot accommodate visitors to their homes off-road the council has no authority to limit the number of visitors we receive or make them a taxable luxury. We would like some clarification to us how you came to the conclusion this would be a fair and lawful scheme to implement in our streets, especially without our knowledge of the full terms of your intent?

We also wish to state we find it totally unacceptable to demand an unbelievable £170.00 for a three car household, especially as some of our households have four cars due to adult children being forced to live with parents because of the current economic climate. Again your actions discriminate against families who, through no fault of their own, are caught up in what is more commonly known as the 'boomerang generation'. Add to this the unacceptable demand of £30.00 for a book of twenty five visits and some households are being forced to pay hundreds of pounds while their neighbour will only pay £10.00. If a fee can be set for £10.00 for **one** car then why not the same fee for **each** car?

It is the opinion of us all that your entire scheme is flawed, from the penalty payments aimed at multi-car households to the visitor's tax. By your own admission the, at times, marginal issue of commuter parking in the above streets does not give the council license to discriminate neighbour against neighbour or put the commuters pocket before the resident in this matter. Commuter parking is solely down to the commuters and **not** the residents. Therefore any fines or 'taxes' should be paid by those causing the issues and not the residents and we certainly will not accept a limitation of visitors to our homes due to the actions of the commuters.

Therefore we residents wish to state our objections and demand a cessation, with immediate effect, of **all** policies to do with the issues of permit parking in our streets due to the discriminatory nature of the scheme, lack of **all** relevant information at the time of consultation and no prior notification of intent before demanding money. We also ask that those residents you have caused worry and stress to and who have bought either visitor permits or parking permits be given a full refund of their money and that a new, fully informative proposal, be brought forward in light of our objections.

Thank you for your attention in this matter and we all look forward to your reply.

Appendix E – Faulkner' Way Submissions

I am writing in response to the public notice in relation to above mentioned amendments to the Faulkners Way parking permit scheme.

You'll be pleased to hear that I had just completed a formal petition of Faulkners Way when the notice went up. The petition itself is attached. This was also presented to the monitoring officer by Sally Wileman as part of an ongoing complaints investigation.

The results of the petition are as follows;

100% of Faulkners Way residents received a copy of the petition requesting feedback (attached)

19 responses were received

14 respondents favoured a review of the existing scheme

5 respondents preferred to keep the scheme as it currently stands

Of the 14 respondents in favour of a review;

2 indicated they would like a review but offered no alternative

6 suggested parking permits working hours only (mon-fri 9to5)

3 suggested a single yellow line

2 suggested restrictions between midnight to 10am (to stop commuters and overnight parking but limit visitor impact)

1 suggested free parking permits and visitor permits for residents

As you will see, none of the residents suggested a 2 hr visitor permit allowance, as per your proposal.

Collectively, the view of the street is that the 24/7 scheme should be relaxed, and replaced with a 9-5 mon-fri system, or a single yellow system. Additionally, a 2 hr visitor slot on top of this would seem sensible.

One possible way to implement this, would be a written letter to all residents guaranteeing ad infinitum that the scheme would not be enforced outside of working hours, and the 2 hr visitor would also be allowed. This would require no signage change.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further BEFORE the consultation deadline of 13/12.

Dear Ms Clay,

Please find enclosed the response to a petition conducted recently, to gather views on the parking permit scheme in Faulkners Way, Leighton Buzzard.

As you will see, there are many positive suggestions from this. The majority of which indicate a preference for single yellow line parking restrictions – or a working hours only restriction.

You will also note that none of the suggestions are for a 2 hr visitor waiting time.

I would also like to point out that the timing of the current consultation being run by Amey is unhelpful as it has overlapped with the petition [which a number of people at the council knew about]. The timing may well result in people believing they have already submitted their views to me, and that the proposed outcome of a 2 hour wait time takes into account their petition response, which of course is incorrect.

Background:

Firstly, the council ran a consultation earlier this year to gauge appetite for a permit scheme. The results were as follows;

38 households in Faulkners Way, of which 22 questionnaires were returned; (58% response).

- 68% of respondents said that commuter parking is an issue
- **8 (38%) support a residents permit scheme.**
- **8 (38%) support single yellow lines.**
- 5 (24%) said leave it as it is
- 1 stated no preference.

You can clearly see that;

- 1) **A part time parking permit scheme was not tabled.** I personally, and incorrectly, thought the parking permit scheme would be 9-5 to address the commuter parking. The council have admitted that **this was purposely not tabled.**
- 2) You will also see that;
 - a. **Only 8 residents preferred a parking permit scheme (out of 38 households)**
 - b. **This is neither a majority of respondents nor a majority of residents**



Secondly, the feedback received from Faulkners Way residents was as follows;

Council representations made by Faulkners Way residents:

Four formal representations were received from residents; the main points raised were as follows:-

- a) The results of the preliminary consultation suggest that **there is not a mandate for permit parking.***
- b) The **problems in this road are a weekday issue, so it is unreasonable to introduce a full time restriction.***
- c) **Single yellow lines would be a better solution for the eastern part of Faulkner's Way where properties have off-road parking.***
- d) The proposed double yellow lines near Bossington Lane should be extended further into the road to address obstructive parking and vehicular conflict.*

Jane Moakes, Assistant Director Community Safety and Public Protection, concluded in her submitted report;

"As there is little outright opposition to the permit parking scheme it is recommended that it be implemented as published. A possible alternative would be to introduce permit parking at the Stoke Road end, but consider single yellow lines in the remainder. However, this would involve publishing fresh proposals. It is suggested that the full permit scheme be introduced, but monitored to see how it operates. "

Note: this can all be freely found on the beds council website – a good starting point is; <http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/modaov/documents/s42341/TM%20REPORT%20Leighton-Linslade%20consider%20representations.pdf>

From my early discussions I understand that many residents would welcome a scheme which will reduce commuter parking 9-5, and ideally also address some of the bottle necks caused at the top of the road caused by insufficient off road parking for many residents.

However, **the current scheme is inconvenient for many residents.** It is cumbersome at weekends and evenings to shuffle cars to allow for visitors, or to have to warn people not to park in the road. A number of **Penalty Charge Notices have already been applied** to cars parked in the street without a permit and this will only continue and gather pace.

What I propose to ask of the council is as follows:

1. Explanation as to **why a 24/7 parking permit was implemented** despite representation suggesting this may not be the best solution
2. **Modification of the existing scheme to a 9am to 5pm scheme Mon to Friday only**
3. **Further dialogue on how to address the shortage of off road parking** at the top of Faulkners Way

To support this, I would ask if you would sign and mark on the attached sheet to show your view on how to move forward. For some of you, the current scheme may be your preferred choice, and if this is so you should state this. If it is the case that a 24/7 permit scheme is the preferred method for the majority then we should all consent to this, however I do not believe this to be the case.

I appreciate your support and have only stepped in because I feel strongly that something should be done before it is too late. Any queries, questions or comments please pop over to number 24 or give me a call on 07436 545341.

Any other comments:

9-5 Mon - for cars preferred

Bays at top of street also causing obstacle and hazard danger due to ways cars are parked.

Minister enforcement

Please modify [^] to 9-5 [^] - but current signage can be kept the same to deter others.

^

^

Any other comments:

Since the introduction of the scheme the road has ceased to be cluttered with cars and commercial vehicles and driving up the road is now much safer than it used to be.

Commercial parking was evident six days a week and frequently commercial vehicles were left in the road over the weekend whose owners were not Foulness wing residents.

The houses at the top of the road all have designated garages in addition to the roadside spaces. It is their choice not to use their garages.

To this end we are happy with the parking scheme arrangements as they stand.

Any other comments:

I TOTALLY AGREE THAT THE COUNCIL SHOULD REVERSE THE CURRENT SCHEME. THE IDEA OF WORKING HOURS (ie 9.5 AM - FRI) IS THE WAY FORWARD

Any other comments:

IF REFUSED

ALTERNATIVE SIDE PARKING

9 AM - 12.30, 1-5 PM - 5 Mon - FRI

Any other comments:

We would like double yellow lines all down the hill (apart from bays at top) as it is dangerous to drive round the bend when going up hill with cars parked there. Also we would like free permit parking for residents and visitors.

Any other comments:

We would prefer the yellow line system. Basically a scheme which forbade parking between midnight + 10am would deal with commuter parking + make it easier for daytime visitors, which we, as retired people, receive. Thank you for taking this up.

Any other comments:

We formally objected to the Council on 13th March on the grounds that this was only a weekday 9-5 problem. We said we would accept the scheme if it was only in these hours, not enough information was given to residents about the scheme in advance which meant this didn't enable them to make an informed decision. All this was said in our e-mail of 13th March.

Any other comments:

We find the 24/7 permit parking totally unacceptable, unnecessary and very inconvenient. We would be happy to support a permit parking scheme if it was weekdays 9am - 5pm, this would be much more suitable.

Any other comments:

As you know Andy, we fully support the proposal
to amend the scheme to working hours only. If the
truth be known Andy, I'm less concerned about getting
an 'explanation' of why it happened - we all know it's been
a mess, but what has happened, "has happened". However,
our objection to the process will derive from a key part

Signed:  of the supporting case for the
scheme to be amended.

Any other comments:

You and your guests can park on the street
under the current scheme. You will of
course need to pay for a permit.
Presumably if permits were free you
would have no objection to the scheme.
So what you are complaining about is
cost. First car permits are £10 p.a. and
visitor permits £30 for a book of 25.
Hardly extortionate for residents of houses
in the £400 - £500,000 bracket and with
drives that can hold 2 cars plus double
garages that can hold 2 more. Sure,
once in a while you may need to move

Any other comments:

I WOULD BE IN FAVOUR OF SINGLE
YELLOW LINES WITH 9-5 RESTRICTION
IF THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE I STRONGLY SUPPORT
MODIFICATION TO THE PERMITS MAKING
IT 9-5 ONLY. I ALSO BELIEVE THE PERMIT
COST IS A MONEY MAKING SCHEME AND
SHOULD BE COST ONLY TO US.

Any other comments:

The scheme as introduced seemed more interested
in collecting fees for permits than removing
the safety hazard of parking on the 'slope'
and so reducing it to one way traffic with
a significant 'blind spot' risk for cars turning
to go up to the main road. Also? parking in
the unmade Bossington Lane.

Any other comments:

WEEKENDS WERE A NIGHTMARE AT TOP
END OF ROAD.
£1-20 FOR A VISITOR CAR IS REASONABLE.
IN MY EYES PARKING SCHEME IS A SUCCESS.
YOU MAYBE RIGHT ABOUT TOP + BOTTOM BEING DIFFERENT.
BE WARN, NEIGHBOUR HAS 4 CARS HE'D LOVE TO PARK
DOWN YOUR PART OF THE ROAD!!

Many thanks for posting your petition through my door (No.9).

Whilst I do agree with many of the points you raise, the scheme as it stands at the present time is much better for us less fortunate folk living at the top of Faulkners Way with NO drives to park on..

We are one of the fortunate families that can park along side our garage, but most can't as it blocks the neighbour's garage access.

I disagree with the fact that as residents we need to pay for the "privilege" of parking outside our own homes, and do feel that although it has stopped the commuter parking problem down here, it has only moved it elsewhere.

On Road Parking -I am guessing you (others) did not need to register for a permit for your car as you have a drive to park on and that is why, when you park on the road you/they are receiving a penalty notice, I presume this as I contacted the council to clarify exactly where you can park without a permit and was told only on your drive or Bossington Lane.

I was told that even if you have a residents parking permit, or visitors parking permit and the car is on any yellow line you will be fined.

Bossington Lane – extending the yellow lines, yes it can get busy down there but this is because some residents are parking their 2nd car down there due to the fact the council feel is it okay to charge £70 for 2nd permit. I'm pretty sure if the 2nd car permit was reduced to £10 the problem would ease.

Weekday Parking Issue - I do agree with you that it can be a nuisance in your case having to move your car to allow visitors to park, and in our case having to pay even more money to the council to purchase visitors permits, but the problem at the top of the road was NOT just caused by commuters.

We had to contend for spaces along with the over flow from The Elms flats, the residents from Stoke Road (terraced houses), visitors for Stoke Road and the Nursing home (plus on a regular basis we had at least 3 untaxed cars left there, which of course they don't now).

Any other comments:

We would prefer the yellow line system. Basically a scheme which forbade parking between midnight + 10am would deal with commuter parking + make it easier for daytime visitors, which we, as retired people, receive. Thank you for taking this up.

Any other comments:

Since the introduction of the scheme the road has ceased to be cluttered with cars and commercial vehicles and driving up the road is now much safer than it used to be.

Commuter parking was evident six days a week and frequently commercial vehicles were left in the road over the weekend whose owners were not Faulkner's wing residents.

The houses at the top of the road all have designated garages in addition to the roadside spaces. It is their choice not to use their garages.

To this end we are happy with the parking scheme arrangements as they stand.

Double yellow lines should run from the top to the base of the E-W slope. This would prevent commuter parking and cars parked in the bay at an angle with their back wheels and car boots protruding dangerously out onto the brow of the hill, which still creates a hazardous situation.

The council should re-assess the parking facilities for these houses at the top of the slope as 3 of their garages have been converted to offices for the Elms, Old People's Home. This means their garage doors are defunct so if they clear the their bushes disguising ~~the~~ offices, 3 parking spaces ^{Faulkner's way} could be created to allow ~~the~~ 3 cars to park in the bay parallel to the road like the parking bay opposite. A 4th space could be provided as the next garage has no door and is full of unsightly junk - this could be turned into a car port, these are situated at back of ^{Stoke Road} Faulkner's way houses in ^{Bossington Lane.} ~~the word~~

The sign at the top of the road should omit ^{the word} permits and say residential parking only, allowing for family visits throughout school holidays - perhaps a different colour line could be painted on the road to represent residential parking. I'm sure if we noticed the same car parked from 9-5 every day Mon-Friday, we could report commuter parking so a notice could be placed on offending car by council.