Meeting: Traffic Management Meeting
Date: 19th September 2018
Subject: Rush Court, Leighton Buzzard – Proposed introduction of waiting restrictions
Report of: Paul Mason, Assistant Director Highways

Summary: This report seeks the approval of the Executive Member for Community Services to the introduction of a ‘No Waiting at any time’ restriction in Rush Court, Leighton Buzzard.

ECOMMENDATION(S):

That the proposed ‘No Waiting at any time’ restriction in Rush Court, Leighton Buzzard be implemented as published.

Contact Officer: Steve Lakin
steve.lakin@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: Leighton Buzzard North
Function of: Council

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Council Priorities:
This scheme supports the following objectives within the Central Bedfordshire Council Local Transport Plan (LTP):

- J - Reduce the risk of people being killed or seriously injured.

Financial:
This scheme will be funded from the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Integrated Schemes budget for 2018/19.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget and Delivery:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost: £750-£1,000</td>
<td>Budget: Local Transport Plan - Integrated Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected delivery: Winter 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background and Information**

1. This proposal was bought forward in response to complaints from residents of Rush Court regarding obstructive parking, impacting their ability to access/egress six allocated parking spaces on land to the rear of their building. A land title plan showing the position of the parking spaces, extracted from Land Registry’s GIS system, is provided at Appendix A.

   The parking spaces to the rear of Rush Court are accessed via Leighton Buzzard bridleway no. 21, which has the title of ‘Windmill Path’. Central Bedfordshire Council’s (CBC) records shown the legal width of the bridleway to be 4-5 yards, extending from Beaudesert for 100-120 yards to the point that it intersects with Public Footpath no. 22. A plan showing the legal line of the bridleway, extracted from CBCs GIS system, is provided at Appendix B.

3. When vehicles park on the section of bridleway immediately opposite the Rush Court parking court, there is insufficient room for drivers to manoeuvre their vehicles into and out of marked spaces, particularly when the adjacent space is filled.

**Proposal**

4. To resolve the issue, officers propose the introduction of a ‘No Waiting at any time’ restriction on the north-west side of the bridleway, from its junction with Beaudesert for the length of the metalled section.

**Statutory Consultation**

5. The proposal was advertised by Public Notice in July 2018. The Notice was posted on site and a copy delivered to nearby properties. Copies were also forwarded to the police, emergency services, other statutory bodies, Leighton-Linslade Town Council and CBC Ward members. A copy of the Public Notice is provided at Appendix C.
Representations

6. Seven people responded to the Notice, with most objecting to the proposal. A copy of all written representations is provided at Appendix D.

7. The salient issues raised by respondents were as follows:
   a) That the parking on the bridleway is not indiscriminate and insufficient of a nuisance to warrant a restriction.
   b) That the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of five parking spaces on the public highway. These spaces being at a premium given the relatively recent introduction of a Residents Parking Zone in Lammas Walk and the significant number of properties within the locale that do not benefit from off-street parking.

8. Respondents took the opportunity to raise a number of related issues, specifically that:
   a) The parking does not obstruct pedestrian use of the bridleway.
   b) The issue with access to the rear of properties on Lammas Walk can be simply resolved.
   c) The introduction of a Residents Parking Zone (RPZ) in Lammas Walk and Bedford Street has resulted in the public highway being ‘under-parked’, to the detriment of residents with properties in Beaudesert, St Andrew’s Street and Rush Court.
   d) Any proposal affecting parking in this area should be bought forward as part of a holistic, area-based scheme given the risk that, by displacing demand, the problem is not resolved but rather moved on to adjacent streets.
   e) The area of land on Beaudesert, adjacent to no. 60 Lammas Walk be adopted as public highway and incorporated into a new RPZ, to the benefit of residents of Beaudesert and Rush Court.
   f) A similar restriction be introduced on the south side of Rush Court to ensure the bridleway remains accessible to emergency vehicles.
   g) Residents would be better served by action to increase parking provision, rather than attempts to mitigate and manage pressures.
   h) Local road capacity has been unable to keep up with increasing levels of car ownership and demand for travel. Further, that the number of zebra crossings contributes to peak-hour delays for drivers using the town’s inner ring road.

Officer comments

9. Regarding the specific objections, it is the view of Officers’ that:
   a) The parking has become sufficient of a nuisance to warrant action, albeit work to install the double yellow lines could reasonably be deferred for a period. This would afford residents the opportunity to collaborate to make the area ‘self-regulating’.
   b) By allowing for parking to continue along the southern side of Rush Court, the net loss is two spaces.

10. Regarding other comments, officers’ offer the following observations:
a) Whilst Windmill Path has the status of a bridleway, there is no obvious signposting at the junction with Beaudesert and hence, is lightly trafficked by pedestrians. This is reflected in a low incidence of reports to the Council’s Rights of Way team regarding surface quality, vegetation clearance, obstruction or signing.

b) The Council has to date been unaware of rear access issues with Lammas Walk properties. Hence, this was not a consideration when bringing forward the proposal.

c) A review of parking in this area of Leighton Buzzard is underway and is likely to propose changes to the Residents Parking Zone (RPZ) that covers Lammas Walk and Bedford Street.

d) The council has adopted an area-based approach to assessing parking demand and initiated several reviews, including the one referenced at c) above. However, there will continue to be instances where it is appropriate to separately advance proposals, particularly when these address road safety and obstruction concerns.

e) The option to adopt as public highway the land adjacent to no. 60 Lammas Walk will be considered as part of the area-wide parking study, which will also consider whether other areas of land can reasonably be converted parking, subject to a planning approval.

f) There is little need for emergency vehicles to access the bridleway.


h) Concerns regarding increasing peak-hour congestion in Leighton Buzzard are acknowledged. The Council’s position, outlined in a previous response on this issue, is provided at Appendix F.

Conclusion

11. It is recommended that the proposal be implemented as published, but with the start of works to be deferred for a suitable period to allow residents the opportunity to reach an amicable, self-regulating solution.

Appendices:

A - Land Registry map extract showing Rush Court parking area.
B - Central Beds GIS map extract showing ‘Windmill Path’ bridleway in relation to Rush Court
C - Public Notice
D – Representations
E - CBC policy on ‘Residential Overspill Parking’
F – CBCs position on town centre congestion in Leighton Buzzard
Appendix A – Land Registry map extract showing Rush Court parking area.
Appendix B – Map extract showing Windmill Path bridleway.

Note: extents of the ‘mapped’ public highway shown shaded brown
PUBLIC NOTICE

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL PROPOSES TO INTRODUCE NO WAITING AT ANY TIME (24 HOURS) IN RUSH COURT, LEIGHTON BUZZARD

Reason for proposal:
For facilitating the passage of traffic on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians).

The waiting restrictions are intended to address indiscriminate parking, allowing residents to gain access and egress to the parking court area.

Effect of the Order:
To introduce No Waiting at any time (24 hours) on the following length of road in Leighton Buzzard:

12. Rush Court, north-west side, from its junction with Beaudesert extending in a south-westerly direction for its full length.

Further Details may be viewed online at www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicstatutorynotices.

Comments should be sent in writing to the Traffic Management team at the address below or e-mail traffic.consultation@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk by 10th August 2018. Any objections must state the grounds on which they are made.

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 Marcel Coiffait
Priory House Director of Community Services
Chicksands Shefford SG17 5TQ

17th July 2018
The Central Bedfordshire Council (the “Council”) in exercise of its powers under sections 1(1), 2(1) to (3), 4 (2) and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“The Act”) and all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Part III of schedule 9 to the Act, hereby makes the following Order:

1. This Order shall come into operation on xxth day of (Month) 201* and may be cited as “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*”

2. As from the date upon which this Order comes into operation, the provisions of the “Bedfordshire County Council (District of Mid Bedfordshire) (Civil Enforcement Area and Special Enforcement Area) (Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2008” shall be varied as follows:-

   To add No Waiting at any time on the following lengths of road in Leighton Buzzard:-

   (i) Rush Court, north-west side, from its junction with Beaudesert extending in a south-westerly direction for its full length.

GIVEN under the Common Seal of the Central Bedfordshire Council
this xxth day of (Month) 201*

THE COMMON SEAL of THE
CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

Signed …………………………………..
Statement of Reasons

For facilitating the passage of traffic on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians).

The waiting restrictions are intended to address indiscriminate parking, allowing residents to gain access and egress to the parking court area.

Further details can be found on the attached draft Traffic Regulation Order, Public Notice and Drawing.

Drawing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed No Waiting at Any Time (24 hours) - Double Yellow Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Limited Waiting (Monday to Saturday 7am to 7pm) - Single Yellow Lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. From: Heather Copley <beaudesert.belle@btinternet.com>  
   Reply-To: Heather Copley <beaudesert.belle@btinternet.com>  
   Date: Saturday, 21 July 2018 at 12:06  
   To: Traffic Consultation <Traffic.Consultation@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>  
   Cc: Cllr Ken Ferguson <Ken.Ferguson@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>, Cllr Brian Spurr <Brian.Spurr@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>  
   Subject: Rush Court No Waiting Proposal Leighton Buzzard

Dear Sir/Madam/Cllrs

I wish to object in the strongest terms to the proposal to prevent parking on the north-west side of Rush Court.

Beaudesert has been severely impacted by the CBC residents only parking scheme on Lammas Walk and Bedford Street and cars that previously were spread around the area, are now all forced to find parking on Beaudesert/St Andrew's Street and Rush Court, whilst Lammas Walk stands largely car free, as a majority of residents have their own drives for their cars.

Beaudesert and Rush Court also provides parking for residents of Vandyke Rd and Hockliffe Street who have no parking on their own roads.I would also like to point out that the 6 flats of Rush Court have only 6 car parking spaces and so frequently park excess cars where you propose to prohibit parking and in the case of the Rush Court man with a large transit van for a carpet company on Beaudesert, often in front of my house.

It would appear that under your proposal Rush Court residents will be able to park their cars and transit vans on my road, in front of my home, when I am denied the same right on theirs?

This morning at 11 am (Saturday 21st July) there were 5 cars parked considerately in the area you propose to prohibit, so may I respectfully ask where you think they should park in future? I can assure you there is no spare parking spaces on Beaudesert, St Andrew's Street or East Street in the evenings or at weekends, that is why they are parked in Rush Court in the first place

If there is to be a car parking strategy, it needs take into account the whole area, an area of older homes without drives and designated parking spaces, not deny access to certain streets, with no thought of the problems caused to surrounding residents, as previously happened with the ill thought out Lammas Walk Scheme. It is for these reasons I oppose this no waiting proposal.

Yours Faithfully

Heather Copley  
12 Beaudesert  
Leighton Buzzard  
LU7 1HZ

2. From: Peter Bate <pcc.bate@btopenworld.com>  
   Reply-To: Peter Bate <pcc.bate@btopenworld.com>  
   Date: Monday, 23 July 2018 at 09:20  
   To: Traffic Consultation <Traffic.Consultation@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>  
   Cc: Cllr Ken Ferguson <Ken.Ferguson@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>  
   Subject: Proposed no waiting order for Rush Court, Beaudesert, Leighton Buzzard

Dear Sir/Madam,

My reasons for objection are:

1. The proposals will make matters worse.
The piecemeal approach to parking matters in Leighton Buzzard, especially in the older areas of town without off-road parking, is clearly failing resulting in a Balkanised mess of schemes that are costly to administer. Each new scheme just moves the problem a few meters further away. Councillors are elected to lead but where is the leadership here? Having a policy whereby parking problems are only addressed under resident pressure is really very weak and just moves the problems into areas where people are less likely to complain.

2. The order is intended to address indiscriminate parking but does this actually exist?
Whilst people do park in the bridleway that forms part of Rush Court I wouldn't say that it is indiscriminate. It is neat & tidy & I doubt very much whether it really is a nuisance. Some of the vehicles may even belong to residents of Rush Court.

3. Central Beds is culpable in causing the problem.
The wholly unjustified controlled parking zone in Lammas Walk & Bedford St introduced by CBC after pressure from residents is part of the cause of parking in the Rush Court bridleway. It should be noted that some residents of Lammas Walk waged a campaign of harassment against anyone who parked in Lammas Walk to the extent that at least three were warned about their behaviour by the Police. Yet by bullying the Council they got what they wanted. Parking in Lammas Walk is a bad as ever but at least nowadays the residents have no one to blame but themselves.

4. Multi-car households in Rush Court.
Some households in Rush Court have more than one vehicle, typically a car & a works van, one of which has to be parked on the road. Some of the vehicles parked in Rush Court bridleway may even belong to residents of Rush Court. Why should residents of Rush Court be allowed to reduce the parking available to anyone whilst using it themselves?

5. Gate opening from the corner house of Lammas Walk onto the bridleway.
This gate is not old. It was added when Rush Court was built and oddly opens outwards rather than inwards which is the usual case. If the gate was installed properly there wouldn't be a conflict with cars parked near it as there is a gravel verge between the gate and the tarmac.

I oppose this scheme because it is piecemeal and fails to address the problems in a holistic way. Councillors have been advised of this in the past by their own officers yet have chosen to ignore that advice.

Yours sincerely

Peter Bate
12 Beaudesert
Leighton Buzzard
LU7 1HZ

---

From: Rebecca Acosta <rebecca.k@gmx.com>
Date: Tuesday, 24 July 2018 at 16:25
To: Traffic Consultation <Traffic.Consultation@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Wilfredo Acosta <w.acosta@gmx.com>
Subject: RE: Public Notice - No Waiting at Rush Court Leighton Buzzard

Dear Traffic Management Team,

Thank you for the recent Public Notice outlining plans to introduce a No Waiting restriction at Rush Court in Leighton Buzzard.

We are writing as residents of Beaudesert. We have lived in this road for over 20 years, and fully appreciate the frustration that the residents of Rush Court feel with the current indiscriminate parking near their flats. We have a young family and unfortunately have used this area to park ourselves, due to the increasing difficulty we have in finding anywhere more appropriate near our home to park.
We live in a very convenient location for the town centre, and our road is constantly used by shoppers, workers and local businesses, some of whom park all day. It is also used by church goers as an overflow car park. The recent resident’s parking restrictions in Lammas Walk has also exacerbated the problem as there are limited options left for the residents of Beaudesert, and we find ourselves competing for a very few spaces with those accessing the town.

There is a section of off road parking marked by bollard spaces, adjacent to the junction with Lammas Walk, which at the moment can accommodate up to 5 cars. Would it be possible for the council to either allocate these spaces to those residents in Beaudesert who do not have a parking space with their home? (9, 4,8,10 and 12 Beaudesert) Or for the site to be sold to us for private parking? We would be very grateful if we could discuss these proposals with a member of your team.

Yours sincerely,

Rebecca and Wilfredo Acosta
9 Beaudesert
LU7 1HZ

4.
From: barry moyes <bandjomoyes@yahoo.co.uk>
Date: Wednesday, 25 July 2018 at 16:17
To: Traffic Consultation <Traffic.Consultation@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: parking rush court

To, introduce no waiting at any time (24 hours) on the following length of road in Leighton Buzzard. Rush court north west side, from its junction with Beaudesert extending in a south westerly direction for its full length. Thank you for introducing the double yellow lines as laid out in your letter of the 17 July 2018. Could I further suggest you put the double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road in rush court, for the first 18 meters or so, down the side of the flats 1 to 6 as marked on your plan. I say this because it would still be possible for 3 cars to park along side the flats( which are very close to the kerb) making it very difficult for the emergency services to get in and out of Rush court. please remember the door to the flats 1 to 4 are at the back of the block, and with the parking that already takes place I don't think a fire engine would get down the back. Thank you Resident of rush court

5.
From: paul drosihn <paul.drosihn@ntlworld.com>
Date: Thursday, 26 July 2018 at 22:28
To: Traffic Consultation <Traffic.Consultation@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL PROPOSES TO INTRODUCE NO WAITING AT ANY TIME (24 HOURS) IN RUSH COURT, LEIGHTON BUZZARD

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL PROPOSES TO INTRODUCE NO WAITING AT ANY TIME (24 HOURS) IN RUSH COURT, LEIGHTON BUZZARD

IThe area affected is at the rear of my property. I observe frequent parking in this area with no problems caused. There was an issue with people parking frequently across my rear gate which exits in this area, however the addition of a large, clear, “No Parking, Keep Clear” sign on the gate has resolved this issue.

Objection:
1. This is not necessary:
   a. No obstruction to vehicles or pedestrians is occurring. Those parking in the area are no more obstructing pedestrians than those parking along Beadesert itself.
b. The area described has NO PEDESTRIAN Walkway. The pedestrian walkway is on the other side, closest to the Rush court flats themselves.
c. The only pedestrian access in this area is my rear gate, which as above those parking in the area observe the sign.
d. Pedestrian access to the bridlepath, Windmill path, is not obstructed because pedestrians may easily travel on the walkway on the opposite side, closest to the flats, then across the paved area.

2. Given the councils recent money-making imposition of resident-only permit parking in Lammas Walk, the council should be consistent in its own approach to dealing with “residents parking”.
   a. The council does not have appear to have tried, or considered even, the opportunity to address any minor issues by using a similar approach to nearby schemes.
      i. I assume the scheme in Lammas walk is “successful” as it remains in place and enforced frequently?
   b. The council does not seem to have considered the impact of such restrictions on nearby areas:
      i. Knock-on effect of Lammas Walk resident permit scheme is to cause those few to park elsewhere, nearby.
      ii. By enforcing this scheme you will force those cars to somewhere else nearby. Surely if they are residents this can be solved by a permit scheme? If they are not residents then they have no doubt been displaced from parking elsewhere.
      iii. Address the issue: insufficient local parking, not the effect: people parking where available?
         1. Manage it, don't over-exert your authority unnecessarily.

3. Inconsistent approach: The council is allowing “unauthorised” off-road parking on Beaudesert, on the Rough ground adjacent to 60 Lammas Walk. I was prevented from buying and improving this land some years ago because the council sought to continue to allow the unauthorised parking, claiming “established use”. If the council intents to unnecessarily enforce new restrictions in the area, it should first enforce restrictions on crossing raised kerb, driving across or parking obstructing a pedestrian walkway and parking on rough council land without permission and without defined, maintained marked and allocated parking bays looked after by the council?
   a. If this is the case then Council should also then reinstate it’s offer for me to purchase said land, and allow change of use to garden land (won't be necessary because it isn't a parking area).
      i. I would point out I’m not advocating this, I am pointing out that you cant restrict parking unreasonably in Rush court, combined with Lammas Walk restrictions, and yet allow indescrimi8nate parking with 20 metres of the affected area.
         Completely inconsistent.

4. Where do you expect those displaced will then park? They will park in another nearby residential area and you will be endlessly implementing new schemes.
   a. Think of a better way to help the residents and those that need, to or would like to, park in the local area. Please?

5. Due process: this is a consultation and your statement indicates further information may be viewed online. Yet the document online (PDF) is the same information as the public notice. It certainly does not detail the number of issues it has been called to deal with relating to this, the resource required (none I expect, since enforcement officers are continually revenue-trawling Lammas Walk) or any other reason than a vague, unsubstantiated, claim of “indiscriminate parking”?

Please keep my details anonymous. Do not publicly disclose my email address.
Response to the Council’s propose to introduce no waiting at any time in Rush Court, Leighton Buzzard

Dear Marcel Coiffait

I am totally against the above proposal and I will explain the reasons in this email.

1. We live at Beaudesert and, like many other residents, don’t have private parking and we struggle on a daily basis to find parking space after 5:30-6pm. Although I rarely park at Rush Court (it is usually full by the time I get home), it is not rare when we have to park our car 1, 2, even 3 blocks away due to lack of space. Several times I had to park at the Baker Street car park. Still, we pay a very expensive council tax (£1,700/year).

2. The stress created for lack of parking space is constantly increasing and all the Council did was to implemented a totally unjustified, unfair and discriminatory ‘permit holders only’ in both Llamas Walk and Bedford Street, despite the residents in both streets being well equipped with private parking, with some houses capable of holding 3 cars. I can only imagine that whoever was responsible for implementing this has never been in the area and I would welcome you to come and see this first hand – I am happy to walk you through – so this can be re-assessed. On a daily basis those two roads have plenty of space (day and night) that could well be used by other residents to reduce the pressure for parking that is being now created at Beaudesert.

3. The limited parking spaces at Beaudesert are also being used by the residents and visitors of Rush Court.

4. The limited parking spaces at Beaudesert are also being used by residents from Vandyke Rd, Hockliffe Rd, South St, East St, Garden Hedge and St Andrews St. This include commercial vehicles (vans) that take huge amount of space. Still, the Council is only protecting the interest of residents from Llamas Walk and Bedford Street.

5. The limited parking spaces at Beaudesert are also being used, during the day, by people that work in the vicinity, including those in the Town Hall (yes!).

6. The limited parking spaces at Beaudesert are also being used by members of the Sacred Heart Catholic Church through the week. They have services Mondays, Tuesdays and Fridays (am), Saturdays (pm) and Sundays (am); weekends are worse than weekdays.

7. There has been some recent road works in the area (Vandyke, Hockliffe and South St), blocking the already limited parking space available there and increasing the pressure at Beaudesert. I would extend my invitation for you to come and see the chaos that is Vandyke Rd in the evenings/weekends with cars parked in both sides of an already narrow road, sometimes on the kerbside, creating a problem to pedestrian, wheelchairs and pushchairs.

If the Council wants to go ahead with this proposal, that is only benefiting one building in the whole area and adding extra stress to the other residents, I will request that the same privilege of having a ‘permit holders only’ is extended to residents of Beaudesert that don’t have garage or private parking space.

The truth is, the town is growing at a rapid pace and the Council is doing nothing to address this in terms of road development, and they are already no coping with it. It is common to be stuck on traffic for some 20-30 minutes in the rush hours; specially towards A4146/A505. Also despite various exits routes, there is ONLY ONE ROAD that cross
the town centre and the bottle neck it creates is huge. A lot of my neighbours and friends gave up shopping in the town centre, especially in the weekends, due to the congestion it creates. It is easier and quicker to go to Bletchley than to try to go to Tesco on a Saturday morning.

Also an important thing that needs to be addressed: one of the main reasons for such high congestion in such a small town that could easily be addressed is the amount of zebra crossings from the Stanbridge/A4012 roundabout (near Morrisons) to the Wing Rd/Leighton Rd roundabout (near Tesco) – there are 16 (!!!) zebra crossings helping to increase congestion in 1 mile. Why can’t they be replaced with pelican/puffin crossing and help improve the flow?

I propose some proper logic is used to address the problem of parking in whole area rather than only fixing one problem and creating a bigger one few meters away. I completely understand the residents of Rush Court complaining about it, but truth is - cars parked there do not really affect their ability to gain access and agress the parking court area.

7.
From: "Brookes, Pauline" <Pauline.Brookes@santander.co.uk>
Date: Friday, 10 August 2018 at 18:49
To: Traffic Consultation <Traffic.Consultation@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk>
Cc: "pauline@brookesfamily.co.uk", 'Nigel Brookes' <nigel@brookesfamily.co.uk>
Subject: Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Rush Court, Leighton Buzzard

I would like to formally challenge this proposal as a resident of Beaudesert

- Additional pressure has been placed on Beaudesert street parking following the decision to make Llamas Walk residents only parking
- Additional pressure is placed on street parking in the surrounding area as a result of attendees at the Beaudesert Catholic Church
- The perilous state of parking on Vandyke Road which results in near 1 way traffic from the Beaudesert junction heading up to Clarence Road & which results in Vandyke residents also using Beaudesert to park
- Beaudesert is regularly used by residents of other streets such as Hockcliffe
- Lack of enforcement of the double yellow line/no parking on the corner of Beaudesert/Vandyke Road which results in frequent illegal parking with associated high risk to pedestrians and to driver visibility when exiting Vandyke Road

Rush Court is a public/no thoroughfare road which provides parking for circa 5 cars, in addition to the private residents parking. Introducing a 24 hour no waiting parking restriction will increase the pressure on Beaudesert; note that visitors to the flats will also not be able to use the current spaces available & will also have to seek alternate spaces. There is ample room for residents to both enter & exit their private parking spaces when other cars are parked on the public part of the road. If the parking restriction is put in place this effectively means it is a private road & therefore should be funded by the residents vs publicly funded. Please confirm that this will be the case.
Please confirm the process which needs to be followed to extend the parking restrictions to residents parking along Beaudesert & to ensure ‘no parking’ is enforced on the corner of Vandyke & Beaudesert.

Overall there appears to be a lack of cohesive traffic planning by the Council which is exacerbating a very difficult situation with an ancient town not designed for the growing number & size of vehicles.

Regards,

Beaudesert
Leighton Buzzard
Bedfordshire
LU7 1HZ
3.12 Residential Overspill Parking

The overflow of residential parking onto local highways has been raised as a significant issue by residents in a number of areas, especially in some of the more congested historic market towns. It can also cause problems in terms of highway safety, traffic management and streetscape. Residents have suggested that the Council should convert green space (including verges) close to these areas into additional residential parking.

However, there is presently no obligation on local highway authorities to provide parking for residential premises and there is no automatic right for residents to park on the highway.

**Policy P14 - Residential Overspill Parking**

Requests for residential overspill parking will be considered by the Council on a case-by-case basis where there is a clear requirement and demand. In providing residents with overspill parking the Council will charge residents for the use of such facilities.

Where overspill parking schemes are promoted by Town & Parish Councils or other such bodies (for example residents or a housing association) all assessment and implementation costs will be charged to the scheme sponsor.
Appendix F – CBCs position on congestion within Leighton Buzzard

The Council recognises that congestion and delays are increasingly a cause for concern amongst residents in Leighton-Linslade, with the feeling that new developments within the town have contributed towards this. In response, we highlight our general approach towards addressing congestion issues. This is focused on a hierarchy of interventions designed to ensure that a sustainable, value for money approach is taken and that interventions can be justified.

The first stage seeks to reduce the demand to travel, particularly in the busy peak period. There are many ways this can be achieved, such as enabling people to work from home or by growing the number of jobs available closer to home.

Secondly, the authority seeks to reduce reliance on the car by promoting alternatives, such as public transport, walking and cycling and encouraging people to car share. This again helps to reduce the pressure on the highway network in terms of the number of vehicles on the road whilst also providing many other advantages to the individuals choosing alternatives, including both financial and health benefits. A major focus in this respect, is the school run.

Thirdly, it is important that we make the best use of the existing capacity on the network. For example are the phasing of traffic lights appropriate and do they enable maximum efficiency? Do junctions allow the most possible number of vehicles through in any given time? Is road space allocated in a way which benefits the most number of people? This ensures that we are getting maximum value and maximum benefit out of our existing assets.

Finally, once all other options have been explored the authority will then consider the potential scope for additional capacity and new road building. This is the final option that the authority will consider because the costs involved are often prohibitive, it does not provide a sustainable solution to growing demand, it undermines the benefits of more sustainable travel options, and new capacity often attracts more car uses and so the same problems can often re-emerge further down the line.

This approach is taken both in the assessment of planning applications once received by the authority and subsequently securing appropriate mitigation from the developers in each instance, and also in terms of the authority seeking to address existing problems on the network and devising our own programme of improvement schemes.

Number, type and positioning of zebra crossings

The town’s inner ring road – comprising Leighton Road, West Street, Leston Road and Lake Street, was comprehensively remodelled in 2008-9, with the replacement of all traffic-signal controlled junctions and crossings with roundabouts and zebra crossings. A 20 mph speed limit was introduced, supported by traffic calming measures. The scheme was well-received, leading to an increase in the number of people walking and cycling, smoother traffic flows and reduced delays and fewer collisions, particularly those affecting vulnerable road users.

Since 2010, the number of people travelling by car during the peak hours has increased. In consequence, congestion-related delays have also increased, including on Saturdays. Drivers’ frustration with these delays is evident and has seen appeals for the decade-old change to be partially or comprehensively reversed. The most frequent request is for the zebra outside of the Leighton Middle School / Riverside Centre to be replaced with a signal-controlled crossing.

Given space constraints, there is no simple way to deliver congestion relief by re-engineering the highway. Greater use of traffic signals would not be a panacea, given there is limited room to add additional capacity at each junction. Removing selected pedestrian crossings would assist flows in the peak period, but disadvantage vulnerable road users. The risk is that people then walk less and drive more. Taking this action would also be counter to the council’s policy of making town centre services more accessible to people travelling sustainably.

This is particularly the case with the popular crossing outside of Leighton Middle School. Because of engineering reasons (bridge deck and multiple service access roads), it is not really feasible to move the crossing away from its current location, a main ‘desire line’. Therefore, installing a push button control would mean converting the Bridge Street junction to signals. The impact would reduce the junction capacity, making the situation worse not better.