



Engagement Report

Appendix R

April 2011

Contents

- 1. Introduction 3
 - 1.1 Myjourney..... 4
- 2. Feedback & outcome..... 6
 - 2.1 Central Bedfordshire Councillors..... 6
 - 2.2 Partners & Stakeholders..... 7
 - 2.3 The Wider Sector and the Local Community..... 11
- Appendix 1..... 186

DRAFT



1. Introduction

Central Bedfordshire Council takes consultation very seriously and this report summarises responses from our varied engagement activities and how we have responded in terms of the development of the LTP and the supporting strategies.

We began the process of developing the Local Transport Plan (LTP) with the specific objective of building a plan that truly reflected the requirements and aspirations of the local community within Central Bedfordshire. As such the engagement of stakeholders, the community and locally elected Councillors has been an integral element in the creation of the LTP for Central Bedfordshire.

The guidance provided by the Department for Transport requires the local authority to develop and use their LTP in a way that works best for them and their community. The guidance states;

"Authorities are accountable to their communities rather than to the Department (for Transport) for both the quality of the transport strategies prepared and for ensuring effective delivery" (Guidance on Local Transport Plans, July 2009). The guidance also states that authorities should take a fresh look at their policies and the implementation proposals; furthermore the guidance strongly recommends exploring more innovative ways of obtaining public views such as councillor led review panels and including the use of web resources.

To enable the local community to be actively involved in the development of their Local Transport Plan and to help to facilitate localism, we have used to our advantage the greater flexibility available for how the LTP could be structured, specifically with regards to implementation. With this in mind we made the decision to develop Local Area Transport Plans (LATP's) as a way of targeting resources and implementing programmes of work that would be wholly community led. We have also developed a web based programme and profile aimed at establishing methods of communicating with a larger segment of the community and in particular sections of society that would not traditionally be involved in local authority consultation.

The outcome of our approach has enabled us to ensure that the community is at the heart of the development of schemes in their local area and through a comprehensive programme of local engagement and partnership working we have produced targeted and specific programmes of work that accurately reflect the needs and issues of local people and deliver added value by enabling our citizens greater involvement in the decision making process.

This method of ensuring that local plans are locally led will not cease with the adoption of the LTP3 and we will continue to engage with local communities both during the implementation of local schemes and with the development of new Local Area Transport Plans.



1.1 Myjourney

In consulting on the LTP, we developed a programme of activity based on the use of a range of techniques for not only communicating a message to people but for building relationships, raising awareness, engaging and consulting with as wide a range of target groups as possible. In order to achieve this we sought to engender the feeling that partners, stakeholders and the public are involved in the preparation of the plan because of its relevance to them. We branded this approach **myjourney**, which is designed to encourage people to help shape Central Bedfordshire by taking an active part in making or influencing decisions that affect their local area.

The **myjourney** brand will continue to be the public face of transport with the aim of helping people to identify with the consultation of their ideas, thoughts and aspirations for transport and the physical implementation of subsequent schemes in their locality. This approach is also reflective of the government's programme for the 'Big Society', which includes proposals to give communities more powers and encourage people to take a more active role in their communities.

The continuation of the **myjourney** engagement strategy will support Government's plans to enable citizens, communities and local government to come together to help solve local issues and to engender the feeling that partners, stakeholders and the public are involved in the preparation of the plan and that it is in fact, very relevant to them.

Rationale

The approach to the LTP engagement and communications reflects government guidance to provide Central Bedfordshire Councillors, partners, stakeholders, wider sector organisations and the public with genuine opportunities to get involved with and influence the development of the LTP and the LATP's.

The LTP Engagement approach is closely aligned to that of The Local Strategic Partnerships (LSP) and the key statutory partners of the LSP including Health, Police Authority, Fire and Rescue Service all have visions that place the citizen at the heart of everything they do. The LTP Engagement approach is designed to help enable this and enhance the community engagement activities and as such the key target audiences of our communications are:

- Central Bedfordshire Council Councillors
- The Local Strategic Partnership
- Local Town and parish councils, especially in the preparation of the Local Area Transport Plans
- Internal & External stakeholders
- Neighbouring local councils
- Wider sector organisations e.g. Healthcare, education, environment, business, 3rd sector organisations, disability, elderly, youth religious, ethnic groups etc
- General public

The approach employs two strands which have been running simultaneously:

1. Central Bedfordshire Councillors, partner and key stakeholder collaboration programme – involving ongoing relationship building and liaison with all partners and their wider networks to facilitate a collaborative approach to the preparation of LTP3



2. Wider sector and public involvement campaign – focussed on using a combination of the traditional communication & consultation mechanisms such as workshops and roadshows but also making best use of Social Media and the internet.

The Central Bedfordshire Councillors, partners & key stakeholder collaboration programme included activities to initiate understanding and forge relationships, including workshops and meetings. Ongoing collaboration and maintenance of relationships will include tailored newsletters and project working groups.

A suite of communications channels for reaching out to wider sector organisations and the public has been established so that consistent information is easily accessible for all. Furthermore because we have targeted our engagement methods to specific groups and utilised the most effective method of communicating with them we have been able to optimise the availability for people to respond in the most effective manner. For example we advised the Town and Parish Councils of the engagement process, attended events to inform and sent communication to advise on how they can be involved in the development of the broad strategic LTP, however we have specifically sought them out when developing the Local Area Transport Plans, where their input is optimised due to the specific local knowledge they hold and the ability of those local councillors to help promote the localism agenda.



2. Feedback & outcome

This Chapter details feedback from councillors, partners, stakeholders, the public and internal or any other external interested parties. The tables also reflect what action we took with regards to these comments.

2.1 Central Bedfordshire Councillors

Engaging with Central Bedfordshire Councillors has been critical in the development of the LTP3 in particular the Local Area Transport Plans, including local councillors in the process from the beginning has been integral to ensuring that we can best optimise the range of interest that they represent. In order to engage Councillors effectively a series of meetings were held which firstly allowed Councillors to detail all the issues within their areas where they would like us to provide a focus. The second set of meetings was used to talk through the proposed programme for their areas. The table below shows the issues which emerged from discussions with local councillors in relation to the Local Area Transport Plans.

<p>Dunstable & Houghton Regis</p> <p>Issues –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Rat running through residential estates”“The negative impact of HGV’s within residential estates”“Access for people with buggies and wheelchairs on buses”“Congestion”“Access to employment, education and health” <p>Options –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Using shared space to make places more accessible for all road users”“20MPH zones”“Lorry bans”“Improvements to public transport”“Improved pedestrian & cycling access to employment and health sites”	<p>Leighton Linslade</p> <p>Issues –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Access to the train station for buses”“impact for local residents caused by commuter parking at the train station”“Improvements to the town centre for pedestrians”“Ensuring that standards are kept up with regards to improvements for cyclists”“Bus services ‘tie in’ with train times” <p>Options –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Complete review of access and residents car parking facilities in and around the train station”“Introduction of shared space designs to improve access for all road users”“Better co-ordination with bus companies”
<p>Arlesey & Stotfold</p> <p>Issues –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Public Transport Links to North Herts”“Access to Station”“Access to schools”“Car parking impacts from school and commuter traffic” <p>Options –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Bus stop enhancements including information provision”“New crossing point near Etonbury School”“Development of cycling network”	<p>Sandy & Biggleswade</p> <p>Issues –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Car parking throughout both town centres”“Impacts of HGV movements”“Barriers to pedestrian movement”“Incomplete cycle network” <p>Options –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Shared space to improve access in Biggleswade”“Removal of guard railing”“Preliminary works to develop bus – rail interchange”“Improved pedestrian / cycle crossing points on approach to town centres”



2.2 Partners & Stakeholders

The commitment of the LTP to be integrated with LSP vision and objectives is demonstrated by the our shared vision, we have therefore made it a central role in our consultation to involve our LSP partners in the LTP development process.

It has been integral to the development of deliverable schemes for us to work closely with organisations such as the police, ambulance service, NHS and the Highways Agency as well as neighbouring authorities and other local organisations.

We have had a long standing series of meetings, workshops, telephone and email correspondence with our partners and stakeholders which we have used to assess each others requirements and roles. Continual communication will be the key to delivery of many of the LTP objectives.

For the purposes of the LTP engagement processes the partners and stakeholders identified are as follows:

- Neighbouring authorities
- Members of the Local Strategic Partnership
- Highways Agency
- Government representative (E.E.D.A)

Engagement activities have taken place with the above organisations intermittently during various stages of the development of the Local Transport Plan and supporting strategies between October 2009 and January 2011. The following table summarises the most relevant topics for discussion and details our response.



Partners & stakeholders discussion and response summary

Organisation /Date	Issue/Discussion	CBC LTP Response
Luton Borough Council – Oct 2009 - Jan 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to have joint working meetings. Overall wish to improve access to employment and health and improve safety. Particular joint funding projects with Dunstable. The LTP for CBC does not include the programme for Dunstable Within the Major Schemes chapter of the LTP there is a section on the Luton Northern Bypass, could this reflect what is written in LBC's LTP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued meetings throughout process Agreed. this also forms part of CBC LTP. Agreed. Intent inserted into the LATP for Dunstable/Houghton Regis. This is included in the LATP document for Dunstable & Houghton Regis – Appendix L with a summary of the schemes in the LTP. Although the agreed schemes will not change the programme will continue to be modified to reflect elements such as; detailed design outcomes and potential to progress with more schemes following external funding and it was agreed that it would be more appropriate to have a changeable element of the LTP separate. We have amended CBC LTP to reflect the joint requirements for this scheme.
NHS Bedfordshire – June 2010 – Jan 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve the opportunities for joint working particularly with regards to healthier lifestyle travel choices. There will be a number of changes within the NHS, one change will be to NHS Direct which will be re-branded but continue other departments relating to lifestyle may also be re-structured which could impact on how 'we' deliver. 	Included in the LTP on both counts and access to health is an objective of the LTP with reference made to healthier travel for other journeys. Until further instruction about changes is clear we cannot be more specific.
Ambulance Services Jan 2010 – Jan 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notification and co-ordination of communication with regards to congestion or issues caused by accidents. 	Agreed. Included within the LTP under network management interventions.
Bedford Borough Council - Oct 09 - Sept 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint working to be reflected in the plan particularly in reference to freight and Major Developments such as Wixams. 	Agreed, partnership working will continue and is noted in the LTP and in particular when the LATP is created for Marston Vale area
Highways Agency – April 2010 - October 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership working and joint opportunities agreed include; A1 near Biggleswade, major schemes such as A5-M1 link, Dunstable specific LATP i.e. change of freight route, de-trunking in general any 	Very positive opportunities available for co-operative working on current and forthcoming projects and LATP's.



Organisation /Date	Issue/Discussion	CBC LTP Response
	issues related to freight and future LATP's.	
Network Rail - February 2010 - Jan 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awaiting reply (contacted at intermittent stages between Feb. 2010 – Jan 2011) 	Await response (31/01/11)
Train operating companies – Feb 2010– January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport and walking and cycling links to train stations Good facilities at stations for cyclists 	Agreed. In general is reflected in the LTP, the LATP's also detail specific schemes to satisfy this.
Milton Keynes Council – Oct 09 – Jan 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No particular specifications but require email contact specifically with regards to any relevant cross border issues. 	Agreed. Contact will continue with the development of the Marston Vale LATP.
Buckinghamshire Council - Nov 09 – Jan 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint working where boundaries cross in particular Leighton Linlade and travel to train station. 	Commuter travel reflected in LATP and need for partnership working. CBC also requested that BCC made comment in their LTP with reference to citizens accessing Leighton Linlade train Station.
Cambridgeshire County Council – Nov 09 – Jan 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership working required for anything impacting the A421, growth, neighbouring LATP and specifically rail access issues relating to St Neots and CBC stations such as Sandy. 	Agreed. Local rail issues identified within the local LATP's. Partnership working will continue with the development of the East Beds Rural area transport plans.
Hertfordshire County Council – Oct 09 – Jan 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership working with relevant LATP development. Inter urban route development where appropriate. 	Agreed. Partnership working will continue. LTP does show a requirement for Inter-urban improvements however given current economic constraints this is linked to growth and external funding such as developer contributions.
Police authority – Feb 10 – Jan 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In general the most related topics focus around controlling speed and rat running through residential areas 	Agreed. The Intervention section of the LTP details a number of measures that will help to reduce speed and improve the highway for all road users in a safe manner. We will continue to work with the police when designing specific local schemes.
East of England Development Agency – Oct 2010 – Jan 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with surrounding authorities to ensure schemes integrate within the region as much as possible. Within Central Bedfordshire measures should include improvement to public transport information and promotional activities. 	Agreed. CBC has engaged with neighbouring authorities when developing the LTP and in more local detail within the LATP's where joint initiatives have been identified. The LTP details within the Intervention section how we will implement a programme to improve public transport

Organisation /Date	Issue/Discussion	CBC LTP Response
		information and also details Smarter Choices initiatives for promotion.

DRAFT



2.3 The Wider Sector and the Local Community

Engaging with the local community and those that represent people's individual needs has taken place through a series of workshops, meetings, exhibitions and road-shows. Additionally, we have placed great importance in engaging as many different segments of the community as possible and also making sure that we are able to keep people constantly updated with our progress we have therefore used a number of social media facilities such as a 'tweets', a blog and a web page on lets talk central which also offered people the opportunity to leave comment and be interactive with the myjourney campaign.

The following demonstrates the opportunities taken to engage and involve the wider sector and the local communities:

- **Individual meetings and telephone/email discussions** - upon request with many local organisations to discuss LTP content.
- **Independent householder survey** – 2,100 local residents were surveyed to help establish a benchmark in which to base indicators and also to establish travel patterns, issues and preferences for change.
- **Interactive electronic development & Myjourney** - Introduction of the Myjourney brand and transport/myjourney page on Lets Talk Central, an important tool in reaching a new audience and offered the ability to have a continual interactive method of communication with our citizens, partners and other interested parties.
- **Advertising and marketing** – so as to avoid 'consultation overload' we have targeted who and how we communicate with people. To this aim we have linked to other central Bedfordshire campaigns for example; Lets Talk Central where we have benefited from the large number of promotional and advertising activities which have taken place. In addition to this we have issued press releases advertising; Myjourney and how to get involved, LTP events such as the road shows and draft LTP opportunity for comment.
- **Stakeholder workshops** – an opportunity for the wider sector and other interested parties to get involved with the development of the LTP and discuss issues pertinent to their organisation or interest.
- **Roadshows** – opportunity for the public and any other interested parties to 'visit' the stand in their local area and discuss their concerns, ambitions and requirements for transport in their locality.
- **Stalls at relevant events** – Where possible we have utilised other events for creating opportunities to discuss, involve and advertise the LTP. Examples of events attended include; Town and Parish Council conference, Dunstable Masterplan Exhibition, Shared Space event and the Youth Parliament seminar. Integrating with other relevant projects also demonstrates the importance of transport strategy in helping deliver wider issues.
- **Officer attendance at community meetings** – We have attended relevant meetings in order to engage with the public and interested groups examples of meetings attended include; Downside Community forum, Dunstable Town Centre Management Committee, Biggleswade Masterplan meetings and local interest groups such as for cycling.

Because of the large number of responses received from the various engagement activities that were undertaken the following tables are split into two sections:

- Section 1: LTP & LAMP Development activities (March 2010 – December 2010)
- Section 2: Draft LTP responses (January 2011 – February 2011)



Section 1 – LTP & LATP Development



Section 1: LTP development activities – My journey campaign. Correspondence received through interactive web page on lets talk central, emails and tele-communications

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
Leslie 6 th January 2011 False economy to remove school crossing patrols, strongly object on grounds of safety and encouraging walking and cycling.	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the Local Area Transport Plans
Flitwick resident 5 th January 2011School crossing patrols, strongly object worried about impact on safety and sustainability, false economy.	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Resident & CBC employee 5 th January 2011 Inaccessibility, other than by car for people trying to access the Chicksands office, also confusing for residents having two main office, could the main office be moved to a more accessible location such as Dunstable.	The location of the main CBC office is outside of the scope of the LTP. However the LTP does have a priority to try and improve the accessibility of council services and will work with other departments within CBC to achieve this.
Joanne - Flitwick 3 rd January 2011	School crossing patrols – Flitwick area. Strong concerns over safety of children and the sustainability.	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Resident 2 nd January 2011	Why are CBC providing hundreds of free parking spaces at Priory House for their staff? Why not introduce a "Pay & Display". Hospital staff have to pay for parking at their place of work and hospitals seem to make a profit on it.	The LTP is supportive of smarter choices measures and in particular travel plans and any subsequent recommendations relating to staff parking facilities would be included within the Staff Travel Plan for Central Bedfordshire Council

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
Dorothy 29 th December 2010	Object to removal of School Crossing Patrols – safety of children.	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Andy 22 nd December 2010	School crossing patrols – Flitwick area. Strong concerns over safety of children and the sustainability.	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Julia 18 th December 2010	The school crossing patrols are essential as many children walk to school without adult support from the age of 8. Savings should be made elsewhere. In terms of the benefit this cost is definitely one worth incurring.	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Gemma 17 th December 2010	Object to removal of School Crossing Patrols – safety of children.	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Mickey 17 th December 2010	School crossing patrols – Flitwick area. Strong concerns over safety of children and the sustainability.	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
		the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Lorna 16 th December 2010	Object to removal of School Crossing Patrols – safety of children	School Crossing Patrols: Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Clive 16 th December 2010	Has anybody ever commented on the appalling state of the pavements in Amptill town centre? There are holes, cracks, sunken manholes as well as a significant sideways slope, all of which pose a risk to anyone on foot.	The LTP recognises the importance of enabling suitable and safe pedestrian access. Unsafe footpaths would be repaired through the annual maintenance programme however specific local issues will be assessed through the development of the Local Area Transport Plan for the Amptill and Flitwick area.
Andy 15 th December 2010	I'm an 'outside observer' on this one and don't know all the details, but looking at announcements elsewhere on this site, would it not be possible to add the new Shefford Health Centre onto the recent 90 Link service (Stotfold to Chicksands Priory House via Clifton and Shefford) operated by J&D Travel?	Public Transport Services: Specific services are being reviewed as part of the Passenger Transport Review. However the LTP does have a priority of improving access to council services so would be a consideration of the LATP for that area.
Resident 14 th December 2010	Living as I do on the very edge of the county, I wonder if anyone has noticed the huge demand for car parking at Arlesy Station. At one time this station was also ran but now this is a heavily used facility where car parking spaces have not kept up with demand. Large numbers of people now park in the only available space in the feeder lane opposite the station. I have no complaints about them being there, or that they do not have to pay (so far) but I do anticipate a time coming when a damp down may take place and that no alternative will be available for parking. It is excellent that people are using the train and not driving on the roads but if we want this to continue, some official backing would be good, even if it only acknowledges that the present parking has a "P" sign so that we all feel confident that our cars will not be moved away.	<i>Response from James Gleave on 16th December 2010</i> Hi Alan, Thank you very much for your comments, and apologies for the slight delay in getting back to you. Like you say, we love to see more and more people using trains, but like many of our commuter stations there are problems with on street car parking around Arlesy station. As part of our work on the new Local Transport Plan we are going to set out how we want to enforce and manage both on and off street car parking across the authority (through a new Car Parking Strategy). But that of course is only part of the solution. We are also looking to invest in the walking,

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
		<p>cycling, car sharing, and a value-for-money public transport network to help encourage those who can travel by other means to the station to do so.</p> <p>I'm sorry that i can't go down into the nitty-gritty of what this means on the ground quite yet, but we are working on it.</p> <p>If you want to know what our Local Transport Plan says, it will be up on our website (www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/myjourney) soon. And if you have any questions, please feel free to email us on myjourney@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk.</p>
James 14 th December 2010	Typical of the 'Council' penny pinch to protect themselves.... surely crossing patrols are a statutory requirement ?	<p>Karen Aspinall (14th December 2010)</p> <p>We completely understand that the school crossing patrol is a valued service but please be assured that we will not stop delivering our statutory responsibilities.</p>
Resident 7 th December 2010	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continued support for cyding in Leighton Linlade very supportive of the measures that have been put in place. 2. Objection to removal of school crossing patrols on grounds of safety and potential to discourage walking and cycling. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This LTP is committed to improving the local cycle network, and encouraging more people to cycle to work, school, and for leisure. The supportive comments on this are greatly appreciated. 2. Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cyding is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Valerie 7 th December 2010	Objection to the removal of school crossing patrols	Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cyding is a priority within



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
		the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Biggleswade resident 3 rd December 2010	Joined up thinking and priorities. Concerns with regards to the use of speed humps as speed reduction measures.	Reducing speed and making an environment more conducive to walking and cycling is an important element of the LTP and the subsequent LATP's. There are many measures that can be used to help reduce speed and schemes identified as part of the LTP will be developed in consultation with the local community.
David – Chicksands 1 st December 2010	Removal of/cuts to mobile library service – Chicksands.	Unfortunately any decision to remove services is outside of the remit of the LTP, however we appreciate the importance of the library service to local communities and as part of the LTP priorities we have made a commitment to try and aid access to council services where possible.
Leighton resident 21 st November 2010	Personal and road safety concerns regarding proposals to turn off street lights.	Street lighting policy does look at removing unnecessary lighting to reduce energy costs and carbon emissions, before any proposals are implemented road, and community safety issues would be fully considered on a scheme by scheme basis including full consultation with local communities before any proposals are implemented.
Jeff 19 th November 2010	Objection to the removal of school crossing patrols	Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Jill - Ampthill 18 th November 2010	Objection to the removal of school crossing patrols	Policy relating to School Crossing Patrols is outside the remit of the LTP, however encouraging and enabling children to travel to school in a sustainable and safe manner, particularly walking and cycling is a priority within the LTP and is reflected in the main document and in local schemes identified through the LATP's.
Gill -Leighton 18 th November	Personal and road safety concerns regarding proposals to turn off street	Street lighting policy does look at removing unnecessary lighting to reduce energy costs and carbon emissions,

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
2010	lights.	before any proposals are implemented road, and community safety issues would be fully considered on a scheme by scheme basis including full consultation with local communities before any proposals are implemented.
Peter 16 th November 2010	Bus users in villages north of Bedford are now seeing new flags and accurate timetable information appearing on some rural bus stops. This results from an audit of rural bus stops undertaken by BABUS earlier this year which has produced a positive response from Bedford Borough Council. Central Bedfordshire Council have yet to respond to the parallel audit undertaken in the eastern part of their territory.	CBC are aware of the BABUS report and as such are extremely grateful for access to such detailed and specific information. The requirement for better infrastructure and in particular information provision has been highlighted a number of times during the LTP engagement process and is therefore a priority within the LTP with more detailed programmes of works within the LATP.
Chris 12 th November 2010	Encouraging more people to Dunstable town centre is a simple process. Make parking free. Free parking would give the town an immediate advantage over other areas and people would start to come back.	The management of parking is an integral element of managing the demand for travel, particularly within town and district centres. It is important to manage and balance the need to ease congestion against the need to ensure measures do not discourage people from coming into the town. Parking policy in Dunstable will be an issue that emerges with the development of the Masterplan.
Richard 12 th November 2010	Maintain current public transport provision and do more promotion – Biggleswade.	A review of public transport is underway and as such I have forwarded your comments onto the relevant team.
Alan 11 th November 2010	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. proposals to turn off street lights. 2. reduce the number of managers & heads, improve procurement processes, close down un-used buildings to reduce costs 3. Re-use road signs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Street lighting policy does look at removing unnecessary lighting to reduce energy costs and carbon emissions, before any proposals are implemented road, and community safety issues would be fully considered on a scheme by scheme basis including full consultation with local communities before any proposals are implemented. 2. noted 3. noted this idea has been forwarded
John 10 th November	Public transport access to Priory House from Western Bedfordshire.	The LTP has made it a priority to improve access where possible to local council services, this must however be



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
2010		done in a cost effective way and will form part of the Passenger Transport Review which is currently under consultation.
Richard 3 rd November 2010	Last year. Thousands of pounds must have been spent on cycle signage in and around Leighton Buzzard both on polls and multicoloured foot path stencils. These are not a legal requirement.	Noted. We will make sure that any future schemes are as refined as possible in terms of what how they are delivered.
Matt 22 nd October 2010	It was with great concern that I heard the mobile library service is under threat. Living in a village it is the only opportunity that many get to visit the library. I hear there is a meeting on the 2nd Nov to present this plan to the budget committee – can you provide information as to who we should lobby against it's withdrawal. Having lost our post office and had our 'local' police station moved to LB as well as there being no practical bus services I feel this is the last remaining link for the village to the outside world!	<i>Response from Karen Aspinall on October 25th 2010</i> Hi Matt, the Council's draft budget strategy is going to our Executive on 2nd November for approval, you are correct. The Executive will approve this as our DRAFT plan to meet the funding gap announced earlier this week. Once Executive have approved this we will inform residents about the draft strategy and how to comment on it. The FINAL budget strategy then goes back to Executive in February for final approval.
James 18 th October 2010	I think the traffic in Leighton Buzzard is a disgrace..... 45 Minutes on a Saturday to get from Hockliffe Street to Homebase... There is a fundamental problem and that is poor planning... building, building, building without infrastructure is destined to fail. I think one of the key problems is Morrisons Traffic Lights these should be replaced with something else and South Street should be closed to through traffic and those pathetic traffic calming measures reduced.	The LTP recommends a number of measures that help to enable more sustainable modes of travel and there are particular priorities relating to new developments to help reduce a potential negative impact.
The Leighton Buzzard Society 4 th October 2010	Here is a travel warning: a Luton to Dunstable Busway will route the South Bedfordshire Corridor into paralysis. I gained my Leighton Buzzard Society job through having travelled through South Bedfordshire since commencing at Luton Grammar School in 1947 and then for work in Luton, Dunstable, and Houghton Regis. I still do this for meetings and leisure matters; and so have a good knowledge of the deteriorating transport situation. A busway will destroy the dual mode rail	The LTP contains the Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway as one of the major projects that will be delivered throughout the lifetime of this LTP. The Guided Busway will deliver numerous benefits to the Luton, Dunstable, and Houghton Regis area, most notable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliable and improved journey times, particularly along the core route which includes town centres,

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>opportunity.</p> <p>Had BR Network South East not had its 1990 Luton to Dunstable (with 7 stations) project as an electrified Thameslink extension thwarted by the then Government insisting BR self-fund the East Coast Mainline Electrification; the busway idea would not have come about. Onward restoration to Linslade and the West Coast Mainline – with South Bedfordshire DC and Bedfordshire CC support would surely have occurred for its immense value to the rail network and the country.</p> <p>The subsequent 1992 idea by the then Department for Transport of “cheap busways from rail routes” has proved to be disastrously flawed with the eventual Cambridge to St Ives experiment! That part of a deeply divided Luton BC who still wish for a Luton to Dunstable busway would be well advised to pause and reflect on these facts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Luton and South Bedfordshire Core Strategy correctly identifies NO east / west rail link and worsening traffic congestion; these points link to the ‘News / Gazette’ report for September 15th on Luton and District car dependency against poor public transport. The strategy also highlights a lack of jobs and so heavy commuting for work; and seeking an expanded LL Airport means more cars. • A widened M1 spells out a third more drivers seeking another route against incidents / accidents. The emerging ‘Outer M25’ Junction 11A with the M1 will have the same effect. • The Core Strategy sets out continued heavy housing expansion through the South Bedfordshire corridor, so with a ‘roads only’ scenario, congestion will carry on worsening year by year, to 2026 plus. Busway serviced would be trapped in congested town centres; for Houghton Regis – having cut through Dog Kennel Down to meet the private industrial Blackburn Road – no guideway is planned onwards so buses would face standing traffic for much of the day. • The Council ruling party say we have a Transport and Works Act Order for a busway. This has been negated by cutting out the prime 	<p>Luton Railway station, and London Luton Airport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to local bus services by investment in new vehicles, and significantly improved bus stop infrastructure in Dunstable and Houghton Regis • The delivery of an integrated ticketing system encompassing all bus operators. • Providing enhanced access to employment through a reliable public transport service, particularly Luton and Dunstable Town Centres, and the Woodside Business Park. <p>The Luton and Dunstable Busway is currently under construction and is due for completion during late 2012. Therefore it is important that LTP3 reflects the current position on the Guided Busway, and provides a basis to help promote and deliver the benefits of the Busway.</p> <p>The Busway has also been included in the Dunstable and Houghton Regis Local Area Transport Plan as a key major infrastructure project. Smaller scale transport infrastructure improvements have been identified in the LATP, many of which will seek to compliment the work on the Guided Busway.</p> <p>LTP3 generally shows strong support for rail as a mode of public transport for a number of journey purposes. This includes identifying and supporting a number of key rail infrastructure projects, such as East-West Rail and the Thameslink Programme, and improving access to rail stations through Local Area Transport Plans.</p>



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>busway function, of a guideway serving the Parkway railway station, this through problems carving through the Gipsy Lane Retail Park, one suspects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While Luton has Leagrave Sidings and has required a rail freight depot with the re-opened Crescent Road sidings – and another is mooted in the Sunday Quarry; Dunstable Woodside and Leighton Buzzard Chartmoor / Grovebury industrial areas need rail interchange depots with the very large distribution and road hauliers presence at these locations – both adjoining a restored rail link alignment. <p>The Bedfordshire and Luton Minerals and Waste Development Plan due to be implemented in 2012 seeks to have bulk onwards transmissions of off-road, by rail, water, or pipeline. Obviously rail will be the major mode, and the Core Strategy backs this aim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council supports the restoration of the Oxbridge: East West Rail Service via Milton Keynes and Bedford. The work by the MK Partnership has brought about extensive benefits for passengers and freight, and with a Cost:Benefit ratio of 6.3 and therefore a very strong business case for the Western Section. If the Council were to get down to doing such work for the South Bedfordshire MML to WCML link, the same high local, regional, national – and international – values would emerge. The Luton, Dunstable, and Houghton Regis Conurbation should on continental and worldwide practice have heavy rail routes augmented with Light Rail Vehicles (formerly trams) and trolley / motor bus routes. As an example, Montpellier in France – slightly smaller, has all these modes with the LRV routes operating 0530 to 0030 hours; such transport systems are being re-created in the British Isles, with Manchester, Nottingham, Sheffield, and Tyne and Wear Metro leading the field, plus Dublin for the Republic of Ireland. The plight of the Grove Theatre in Dunstable – literature states “no 	

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>rail station in Dunstable – use Leagrave” – would be eased with a Dunstable Park / Central station at 4 minutes walk away.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For LL Airport as at many others so provided, the long overdue people mover from the Parkway railway station to the terminal should be provided; the Council having acquired EU funding for it from the airport. Also, spur lines should be promoted from the MML to allow First Capital Connect local trains to serve a station under the terminal against any future significant expansion of flights; as is the provision at Stansted. Much work has been carried out to support rail restoration through the South Bedfordshire Corridor and is documented. In 2004 Corus Rail Consultancy, engaged by Dunstable Town Council, did a Luton to Dunstable study to prove a grade separated junction is feasible at Luton to the MML ‘slow lines’ and this plus a start-up track renewal to Dunstable lies within the £89m basic busway cost. Chiltern Railways have offered start up services and can provide simple stations; and the Association of Train Operating Companies has dedared Luton to Dunstable as an “easy restoration” and onto Linslade as “achievable”. The major developer at Leighton Buzzard accepts that the key to the sustainability of their South and East housing expansions in the provision of both a Leighton Buzzard South and Stanbridge Parkway stations. The Delco housing site at Dunstable – formerly the largest source of jobs, but now none – could have a very convenient adjoining North station on the former fire station site; trackbed also adjoins. The Council has received, from my professional association a copy of the Railfuture “Britains Growing Railway – 2010”. This lists the turn around from the short sighted Beeching era closures; with 366 restored / new stations and 822km route miles added to the network; mostly via progressive councils. At the Council re-vote on the Busway, Bedfordshire CC having ceased to be a promoter, Cllr Garrett warned that ‘it would be 	



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>Luton's Greatest White Elephant". Cllr Davis replied "if the busway fails, we will put back the railway". This would require huge funding, with the whole formation dug up and the Guildford Street / Mill Street / New Bedford Road to Telford Way gap to re-construct. This on top of the lost busway expense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Carter, one of several departed Council Executives, was faced with a Northampton venue 'London to South Midlands Multi-Modal Study' conference question; "What will ensure multi-modal transport success?" His reply was "make maximum use of existing infrastructure and look over boundaries". Wise words indeed. • Kelvin Hopkins, Luton North MP, speaking to BBC 3C Radio on 27th September from Manchester, said he was "enjoying their excellent trams". The routes are currently being expanded. <p>So a warning. Lutonians and South Bedfordshire population out to Linslade desperately need dual mode transport: road balanced with rail restoration. 60% of the Bedfordshire population live along this corridor, with NO rail link; BUT Luton / Bedford and Linslade / Bletchley / Bedford rail services exist. Mid Bedfordshire has the use of 3 rail lines.</p> <p>If attempted, the busway will see South Bedfordshire slide into transport paralysis and sustainability disaster. There is no popular support for the busway, but heavy support for return to dual mode with rail restoration. This shows common sense to the fore.</p>	
Nick – Cambridgeshire resident 28 th September 2010	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better public transport information provision particularly at interchanges. 2. correlating bus and train times 3. Dedicated off-road cycle routes have to be part of the answer too(Sandy area) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. Provision is allocated within the LATP programme. 2. Noted. A Smarter choices programme is within the LATP programme and will include examining the potential of how services can better integrate. 3. A number of cycling infrastructure improvements are within the LATP for Sandy.
Mike 14 th September	Bus timetables that better connect with train times	Noted. A Smarter choices programme is within the LATP programme and will include examining the potential of

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
2010		how services can better integrate.
Robyn 23 rd August 2010	<p>2 main points for me.</p> <p>When will Leighton Buzzard train station be made wheelchair friendly by installing a lift to the platforms. Currently wheelchair users reaching Leighton Buzzard from London need to go to Milton Keynes to use the lifts and then reach Leighton on one of the trains heading back to London.</p> <p>Also, can bus stops be marked or it be made dearer how users are meant to know where a bus will stop. Currently I have no idea where I can get on or off buses in my area and so don't use them. I can't be the only person put off by this – increased signage or publicity can only increase bus use.</p>	<p>James Gleave (25th August 2010)</p> <p>Hi Robyn,</p> <p>In response to your questions, the date for the new lifts at Leighton Buzzard hasn't officially been confirmed yet, but we understand that the new lifts are likely to be in service sometime in 2013/14. They are being installed as part of the Government's Access for All Programme of works at railway stations. But there is a health warning with this, in that this scheme along with many others may be subject to cuts in the Government's October spending review. We certainly hope not, as this is something that Leighton Buzzard has campaigned for many years about!</p> <p>As for the bus stops, in what area of Leighton Buzzard are you referring to? And is it a case of the bus stop flags missing, a lack of timetable casing or both? If you let us know, we will see if we can do something about it. As for some general advice on finding out where your local bus stop is, try Google Maps. If you zoom in on a main road near you and follow its length, it will show the bus stops, and the times of the next buses to depart from these stops. Best of all, you can then look at these stops in Streetview! Also, if you want a general idea of what buses run in your area, I highly recommend that you look at our bus maps. We even have an area map for Leighton Buzzard.</p> <p>I hope that the above is of help. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact us again.</p> <p>James</p> <p>Robyn (27th August 2010)</p>



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
		<p>Hi James,</p> <p>I live in the Brooklands area of Leighton Buzzard. The stops have no flags or timetables at all. The paper timetables showing route maps and timetables show which roads are used but give no indication of the bus stops once you leave the main road. Google maps indicates where some 'hail and ride' stops can be found although I would be more willing to trust this if there were some physical sign on the ground. Using Google maps to find out about bus stops is ok for me – I'm lucky enough to have internet access – but many bus users, particularly the elderly, do not have internet access.</p> <p>Good news about the station lifts, but I will wait to see building work start before I really get my hopes up.</p> <p>Thank you for responding,</p> <p>Robyn</p>
<p>Claire 26th August 2010</p>	<p>Local villages in question- Upper Caldecote, Ickwell, Northill & Old Warden. Many of our local villages now share community services for the young and old – recreation grounds, playgrounds, pubs, playgroups, pre schools, lower schools, post offices to name a few. Improving the potential for better walking and cycling routes in rural areas</p>	<p>Noted. The LTP has a priority to help enable walking and cycling as healthier lifestyle choices and will work with partners in undertaking this. Specific detail for local improvements will be within the LATP's.</p>
<p>The Leighton Buzzard Society 19th August 2010</p>	<p><u>CBC Local Transport Plan 3 and the Luton and South Bedfordshire Core Strategy</u></p> <p>With both documents in the course of preparation – and for transport matters (which interact with virtually all other subjects) being complimentary – this letter sets out the Society papers already on deposit with Central Bedfordshire Council.</p> <p>In anticipation of the promised public consultation / workshops on both LTP3 and the Core Strategy, the Society commends digesting our papers, to</p>	<p>We thank you very much for your response, and the details of previous correspondence that you have delivered to Central Bedfordshire Council.</p> <p>The development of LTP3 has been undertaken in close co-operation with a number of other statutory planning considerations, notably the Local Development Frameworks for the North and South Bedfordshire Areas. As a result of this co-operation in development, the aims,</p>

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>ensure the grave shortcomings in transport affecting the South Bedfordshire natural corridor of Luton, Dunstable, Houghton Regis, Stanbridge and the nine surrounding rural villages to Leighton-Linslade will be attended to, in a phased way. Against the existing 'roads only' single mode situation producing ever worsening traffic congestion, a move to dual road / rail (plus walking) is crucial for any hope of sustainable movement in the future.</p> <p>Documents on deposit are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.08.2009 – Meeting with Cllr Tom Nicols, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Transport Planning, at Chicksands. Myself, with Andrew Long (Flitwick) representing CBC North transport views, handed over an Agenda on transport matters together with a run down of LTP3 needs. • 08.12.2009 – handed in to the CBC Executive Meeting at Chicksands. A statement on the transport plight of the South Bedfordshire corridor – plus an Appendix A – rail possibilities – for Bedfordshire and beyond: existing / proposed / possible routes (adjoining counties have rail development officers). • 12.01.2010 – handed in as for 08/12/2009. A follow-up statement, against CBC minutes available. • 11.02.2010 – I wrote to James Gleave – CBC Senior Strategic Transport Officer on the need to make actual progress on LTP3 preparation. • 06.04.2010 – handed in to the CBC Executive Meeting at Chicksands a copy of the 5th edition of 'Britain's Growing Railway: A-Z on re-openings: stations and routes'. <p>NB1: When Cllr Ken Matthews was the shadow Portfolio Holder for Transport prior to the 2009 elections for CBC, he kindly allocated an hour at Chicksands to the plight of South Bedfordshire. He has a good grasp of matters – and copied many of the Society papers. Presently, I have pointed</p>	<p>objectives, and implementation plan of LTP closely relate to planned developments and the wider spatial strategy for the authority. As the Core Strategy for South Bedfordshire and Luton emerges, LTP3 will be reviewed in light of any significant changes.</p> <p>The LTP contains the Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway as one of the major projects that will be delivered throughout the lifetime of this LTP. The Guided Busway will deliver numerous benefits to the Luton, Dunstable, and Houghton Regis area, most notable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliable and improved journey times, particularly along the core route which includes town centres, Luton Railway station, and London Luton Airport • Improvements to local bus services by investment in new vehicles, and significantly improved bus stop infrastructure in Dunstable and Houghton Regis • The delivery of an integrated ticketing system encompassing all bus operators. • Providing enhanced access to employment through a reliable public transport service, particularly Luton and Dunstable Town Centres, and the Woodside Business Park. <p>The Luton and Dunstable Busway is currently under construction and is due for completion during late 2012. Therefore it is important that LTP3 reflects the current position on the Guided Busway, and provides a basis to help promote and deliver the benefits of the Busway.</p> <p>LTP3 generally shows strong support for rail as a mode of public transport for a number of journey purposes. This</p>



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>out to him in his Regeneration and Development role, that the cleared site of the Dunstable Fire Station is perfect for a restored Dunstable North Station – with the trackbed towards Stanbridge and Leighton-Linslade adjoining. This site is opposite the former TRICO site, Dunstable's largest employer – now for housing development, but jobs lost. Although west Houghton Regis is very close by.</p> <p>NB2: James Gleave, from a telephone request to him last month, has undertaken to collect up copies of the above papers, by liaising with Devina Lester – CBC Committees Official.</p> <p>NB3: For the Core Strategy process, the Society made full returns against the June 2007 and April 2009 Public Consultations. I also wrote to David Atkinson, Joint Technical Unit Team Leader, on 11.06.2009 – emphasising the need for vision and action to deal with the South Bedfordshire corridor transport problems; and welcoming a meeting with him (no reply to date).</p> <p>The Core Strategy: Pre Submission Draft of July 2010 – correctly identifies the South Bedfordshire problems of ever-worsening road conditions, poor east / west road links and no rail link, continuing heavy house building (particularly for Leighton Buzzard and Houghton Regis), not enough jobs so extensive out commuting. It hopes for further expansion for London Luton Airport.</p> <p>The solutions for movement on offer – The Busway idea and extending the 'Outer M25' by the Dunstable and Luton North Bypasses from its present A4146 / A505 termination at the A5 (Thorn) will not turn around the South Bedfordshire east / west movement plight. That on the Luton North / South Midland Main Line rail route – a fourth station at Sundon Park (widened M1 Junction 11A) and a road / rail freight interchange at the former Sundon cement works site – does represent vision and sustainability.</p> <p>What will turn around the east / west movement problem for the South Bedfordshire Corridor is a standard gauge rail link restored from the MML in Luton to the West Coast Mainline in Linslade. Thus local, district, regional, national, and international journeys become possible for both passengers and freight. LLAP would see its poor surface connections greatly enhanced,</p>	<p>includes identifying and supporting a number of key rail infrastructure projects, such as East-West Rail and the Thameslink Programme, and improving access to rail stations through Local Area Transport Plans.</p>

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	with significantly less car usage. Civil Societies, although non-statutory, have good standing in culling what public concerns are; and working out solutions. The Leighton Buzzard Society is no exception, being very active and connected.	
Steve 12 th August 2010	Cost of using public transport.	The LTP itself cannot directly reduce the amount paid for public transport. However the LTP does have a commitment to work with operators.
Del 11 th August 2010	1. Introduce congestion charges in Dunstable. 2. I travel from South West Dunstable to Vauxhall in Luton each day using the Caddington road. Walking and cycling along this road is extremely dangerous; there is no pathway for most of the route, and where there is a pathway, it is overgrown. A proper pathway/cycleway would make walking and cycling much safer, and that goes for motorists as well.	1. There are a number of proposed measures to better manage congestion in Dunstable such as the A5-M1 link, there are no current proposals to introduce congestion charging. 2. Noted. There is no funding available within the current LTP budget, however it will be added to the programme should related external funding become available.
Peter 10 th August 2010	The present Health Centre in Shefford is located just off bus routes M1, M2, 200, 79 and, as from 9 Aug, 90. The new health centre is being relocated to an edge-of-town site with no bus access. It will, no doubt, have an extensive car park? Not all patients drive or have exclusive use of a car. Walking or cycling may not be an option for the frail or elderly. Is this a practical demonstration of the policies of the unitary authority designed to encourage greater use of public transport?	The access to services element of the LTP in this particular instance relating to health has priorities that would help address these issues in the planning process.
James 10 th August 2010	The Baulk in Biggleswade is *CRYING OUT* for a residents parking zone.	Noted. Parking issues are to be addressed as part of the LATP and the masterplan for Biggleswade.
N ALI 9 th August 2010	There needs to be more evening buses directly from Dunstable in the evening e.g. to cities such as Hemel Hempstead, Watford and Milton Keynes, and St. Albans.	The LTP does have a priority to work with operators and neighbouring authorities with an aim of helping to improve services. This must be done in line with the Passenger Transport Review and any budget implications.
Vic 7 th August 2010	We have both moved to cycling from access to Biggleswade station. We MUST be more serious about cycling with more and improved safe routes away from heavy traffic. A lot can be done at small cost adapting existing sufficiently wide footpaths to shared pedestrian/cycle ways and adding	Noted: the LATP for Biggleswade details schemes that would help improve pedestrian and cycle access particularly to the train station.



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	signing to existing routes.	
Clive 6 th August 2010	I would like the Lorry route through Luton properly signposted throughout. Specifically the minor connecting roads 'off of' the official lorry route (i.e London Road, etc) should be signposted as the Daventry Lorry Route,	This comment has been forwarded to our colleagues in Luton Borough Council, however we are working with LBC on joint initiatives including better management of freight traffic.
Pat 6 th August 2010	Yes, a bypass would be nice but don't we already have one: the M1. Why not stop lorries entering Dunstable during daytimes and have deliveries only at night when the road is less congested. I'm 69 and have a bus pass. This is the one thing that makes me use public transport otherwise the cost is too high.	Noted. As part of the proposals for the A5-M1 link the current A5 running through Dunstable would be de-trunked which would in essence allow us implement restricted access for lorries if appropriate.
Steve 6 th August 2010	Dunstable guided bus way – should be a train rather than a bus with a new station at Dunstable and connections also to Leighton.	The busway was deemed the most appropriate and economically viable option. Improvements will include new interchange facilities with fast services in operation.
Barry 6 th August 2010	I am medicaly unfit to drive so, I cycle everywhere, no problem except Keep Left Bollards	Noted.
Peter 6 th August 2010	Implement, without further delay, RTPI (bus) at key nodes eg Biggleswade Bus Station, Shefford Southbridge Street, Flitwick PO/Rail Station.	Consideration will be given for improving information provision within the LTP and in specific detail within the LATP's
Christian 6 th August 2010	As a keen cyclist I do enjoy the space that the people of Houghton Regis and Dunstable give me when I am on the road.	
Sandra 26 th July 2010	Reduce the cost of cost of bus tickets and Please improve the bus stop in Flitwick opposite the post office which is disgusting. Please cut grass properly and remove overhanging branches from footpaths	The LTP has a priority to work with operators to help improve services, however this must be done in context of budget restraints. For immediate maintenance issues these can be reported to the Highways Helpdesk and this message has been

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>There needs to be less emphasis on cars and more on public transport. Flitwick has a train station which is dangerous to access because of cars on the bridge, there are no slowing down measures at all in the racetrack known as Flitwick. The buses all arrive at once instead of being spaced out during the day; Stagecoach and Grant Palmer compete for the same routes into Bedford, meaning that 3 buses arrive at once. The pedestrian traffic lights take forever to change, meaning that by the time the traffic has finally cleared, they eventually turn green; very annoying</p> <p>Id like to cycle to my allotment in Steplingey Road, Flitwick but the journey is far too dangerous thanks to car drivers and lack of safe cycle paths. The area between the high street and stepingley road is particularly dangerous and unpleasant</p>	<p>forwarded onto them.</p> <p>Your local detailed knowledge of Flitwick is most welcome and we will be consulting in more detail the resident in Flitwick when we begin to develop the LATP in 2011.</p>
Judi 3 rd July 2010	Sort out the mini roundabout just off the railway bridge in Flitwick. That roundabout serves 4 roads and the turning traffic from King's Road and it's a bottleneck at rush hour and both inadequate and dangerous for the remainder of the time. You need a better method of traffic control there.	Noted. There are plans to improve this roundabout.
Carolyn 29 th June 2010	<p>Having lived previously in Berks and near Manchester it is great to be able to get to work without many traffic problems....although the roadworks at M1 junction 13 could be better managed at them moment with a load of unnecessary cones causing rush hour queues.</p> <p>Some of the footpaths could be improved, we can all see the money that was spent on the area around the Chicksands offices where very few people live and are likely to walk, whereas the footpath along Church Street, Ampthill (and in fact all the way to Maulden) is a mess and is full of holes, and covered in mud. In wet weather it is always very puddly, and I can't imagine what it is like pushing a push chair along there.</p>	<p><i>Response from Alan Ferguson on 30th June 2010</i></p> <p>Hi Carolyn</p> <p>Having also worked around the Liverpool/Manchester areas I can appreciate where you are coming from on the time to commute in and around these areas, so yes it is easier around Bedfordshire.</p> <p>As far as I know, the M1 work is dealt with by the Highways Agency. I have had a look on their website and found this information http://www.highways.gov.uk/roads/projects/4584.aspx – quite heavy traffic figures quoted at 25,000 vehicles a day in the area. I hope this is of some use, even if it doesn't solve the issue of travelling at peak times in the coned</p>



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
		<p>area.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Alan</p> <p><i>Follow up response from Carolyn on June 30th 2010</i></p> <p>Thank you, I already subscribe to the updates so that I know if there is anything major happening. I just find it frustrating to have lanes closed during the day, for no apparent reason – in the evenings it is chaos. Only a few more months and it should be open – then we can see if the new road layout works....I have my doubts for the roundabout from the motorway.</p>
Tom 28 th June 2010	<p>Toddington is a great place. The village has a good range of shops, two good schools, eight pubs/clubs and a great community. But the accessible public footpath network is an absolutely great way of quickly getting into the countryside.</p> <p>Follow the approach in Toddington of removing stiles and other unnecessary barriers on footpaths – it really does get people out and walking.</p> <p>Provision of a cycleway between Toddington & Harlington. The new J12 bridge will include a cyclepath, but it needs to continue all the way between Harlington and Toddington. It would provide a safe route for teenagers to meet friends in either village, and for Toddington commuters to get to the station.</p>	Noted. Thank you.
Carolyn 27 th June 2010	<p>Amphill is facing challenges – like many other towns – the shops struggle to keep going, as peoples shopping habits change, but a town without any shops will not be the same.</p>	<p>Response from Alan Ferguson on June 30th 2010</p> <p>Hi Carolyn</p> <p>This is just in from Central Bedfordshire Council's</p>

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>We used to have a busy Farmers Market – but that is gradually running in decline it was moved out of the main car park a few years ago and has never been the same – Central Beds do not give any initiatives like that any support, even by offering advice/expertise, rather than financial help. I understand there was a request to move it and the man in 'Highways' was dealing with the necessary paperwork to approve the move – but nothing happened.</p> <p>It also has a problem with parking, the only car park in town is run by Waitrose and has 2 hours restriction, there are plans to build one on the edge of town...but I am not holding my breath. I do feel that there appears to be a lack of interest in the town centre by the Council, particularly since the officers have left town to go to Chicksands and beyond.</p>	<p>transport team. They have had a study undertaken to quantify what the extent of the problems are and look at viable options (both on and off street). The report identified that another off street car park of approximately 100 spaces offering stays longer than 2 hours would be appropriate.</p> <p>Whilst the council does not have the budget to undertake work to facilitate a new car park of this size, planning consent has been given for a new residential development on the old Gas Works site in Amptill just outside the town centre and the developer has agreed to provide a car park of this size. The provision of the car park is dependant on the development and therefore we do not know at this point when it will be built and brought into use.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Alan</p> <p><i>Follow up from Carolyn on July 2nd 2010</i></p> <p>They have started digging in the orchard, 2 years after the planning consent – but I am sure it will be a year or so yet before any parking spaces are available.</p> <p>Incidentally the site is already flooding from the stream/spring on the land, one digger sunk and had to be dug out by another...I hope they know what they are doing and that the water doesn't effect the land around it, or my property which is near and has a culvert running beneath the garden for the stream.</p>
Phil 23 rd June 2010	It is a very dangerous thing today riding a bike crazy car drivers and pot holes and lorries that brush up against you scary and why do we	The LTP will promote the requirement to assess schemes for use for all road users including cyclists.



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>have drains in the side of the road,,,,other countries have them in the kerb stones so much safer</p> <p>Safer bike routes , I think everyone should try riding a bike on the roads today , see how scary it can be</p>	Thank you
Kevin 21 st June 2010	<p>it always seems to me that Central Bedfordshire loses out in the government funding...</p> <p>i would hope that after 80 years, Dunstable finally gets a bypass, and i would also be happy if Dunstable managed to get it's railway line back...</p> <p>Making it cheaper, more convenient and giving more options</p> <p>The prices are too expensive for people to afford regularly, the services are not very useful and are bad, and there is little service available – especially in Dunstable....on this side of town the bus comes once per hour, takes half an hour to get into town, and costs around £2 i believe, for what would be a 10 minute walk...and getting to other places by rail is a nightmare, as the buses to the stations are too expensive and inconvenient in the first place.</p> <p>Rail link to Luton and/or Leighton Buzzard</p>	<p><i>Response from James Gleave on 21st June 2010</i></p> <p>Hi Kevin,</p> <p>You may want to see my response to Bev Whayman regarding the Dunstable Northern Bypass on the transport pages. I hope that you find it informative.</p> <p>James</p>
Kevin 21 st June 2010	<p>There are three main problems:</p> <p>Firstly, the Bypass that Dunstable needs that has again been put on hold and secondly, the busway that no-one wants here, but is being forced on us instead of the bypass</p> <p>and thirdly, the cost and inconvenience of public transport – it is ridiculously extortionate.</p>	The LTP along with the passenger transport review will seek to ensure that we are working in partnership with operators.
Bev 21 st June 2010	<p>Hi,</p> <p>This is a great idea, Let's Talk Central. Communicating with the communities in Central Bedfordshire.</p> <p>As regards 'Transport' Dunstable's main concern is the A5 M1 Link road.</p> <p>The public enquiry has been suspended, however the busway is to go ahead. Many would say why has the busway been given the go ahead when the A5 M1 link road has been needed for '50 years' has been suspended?</p>	Thank you. Central Bedfordshire Council fully supports the A5 M1 link and is doing all it can to ensure it will be a government priority.

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	As we all know there are Government spending cuts, can not some funding come from CBC to at least start the bypass? There will be obvious continual outlays for the busway but the A5 M1 link will benefit, industry, business and most of all the health of the people in and around Dunstable who have to breath in the fumes continuously.	
Fred 18 th June 2010	I'm more concerned that if I had a bike, it would stolen by some estate creep	Noted.
Sharon 18 th June 2010	Not everyone works the same horus therefore it would be difficult to introduœ car sharing. I work in Kempston, buses from Flitwick do not stop where I work. I would have to get 2 buses and if I as required to travel during working hours for business purposes then this would also cause a problem. Public transport is fairly expensive in Bedfordshire. In the north of England, Yorkshire in particular, they charge £30 per month for a pass. – you can travel anywhere within the South & West Yorkshire areas on any train, bus or tram at any time. Why not trial it in Bedfordshire?	Noted. The LTP will help to ensure that we work better with bus operators in particular to investigate better methods of ticketing etc.
Kelly 14 th June 2010	I live in Shefford and work in Bedford and the times of buses are not satisfactory.	Part of the development of the LTP will be to establish mechanism of working with neighbouring authorities and bus operators to establish whether any cost effective improvements could be made to services.
Paula 14 th June	I would car share to Dunstable from Flitwick but because of the road parking restrictions that have been introduced, I cant. We have to move our car from one side of the road to the other half way through the day and the safe laybys we have cannot be parked in for two hours.	Noted. Car parking restrictions will be assessed as part of the development of the Local Area Transport Plan for Dunstable.
Jerry 14 th June 2010	I would cycle or run to work which is three miles away instead of driving, but you have put ridiculous parking restrictions on our road, since we have lived there.	Noted all areas in central Bedfordshire will have their areas assessed in terms of parking provision and restrictions as part of the Local Area Transport Plan Development.
Chris 10 th June 2010	More cyde training for school children (and adults too!). Gives people the confidence they need to use two wheels for those short journeys around town	Noted. It is the intention of the LTP to encourage walking, cycling and in general healthier lifestyle travel choices.



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<p>More public transport options please, and more encouragement for walking and cycling. Driving is obviously necessary for many people in many cases, but, equally, many people could use their cars less thereby reducing congestion and pollution. Most journeys are under 5 miles – ideal for a bike (which are free, fast, keep you fit, give you freedom, and are much more fun than sitting in a traffic jam!)</p>	
<p>Andy 9th June 2010</p>	<p>I support the idea of cycle lanes where it's possible to provide them</p> <p>In Biggleswade, cyclists also have to cope with a one-way traffic system that is not at all cycle-friendly once you get into it – all routes seem to head out toward Langford and not back into Biggleswade – at least not easily.</p> <p>To help this some contra-flow cycle lanes where existing one-way streets are wide enough would be of great benefit, say in Foundry Lane from the Health Centre back to the Market Square, or even in Hitchin Street.</p> <p>For example if one starts in Dells Lane and cycles to the Doctor's surgery in Saffron Road via the railway station bridge, the only 'legal' way of cycling back (approx 200 yards via Saffron Rd and the station bridge as the crow cycles) is to cycle all the way around the one-system via Teal Road, St Andrew's Street and the Market Square etc – probably 8 times the journey distance and not the safest of routes for cyclists at any time.</p> <p>There was a time when trains had secure storage areas (for the now defunct parcels service) usually next to the Guard's compartment. Sadly, those are no more and cyclists, where allowed, have to bring their bikes into the passenger compartment, usually blocking the doorways. It should be possible to incorporate bike areas into carriages (if that's where they must be) by having seats that fold up perhaps? I suspect that with current overcrowding and seating at a premium this would not be a priority for the train operating companies.</p> <p>An alternative could be a system where cyclists could 'garage' their bikes at the home station – possibly having a second bike at their destination so that</p>	<p>Noted. It is the intention of the Ltp to produce Local Area Transport Plans which will look at the issues in our local towns. Biggleswade is currently being developed and your comments being assessed in terms of potential improvements to walking, cycling and interchange facilities.</p>

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	they don't need to take their bike on the train at all, but know that the bike is safely stored and will be there when they get to their destination...and when they get back	
Andy 9 th June 2010	<p>Road humps – take them all away – As a bus driver I do my best to cause serious discomfort to my passengers – but no two road humps are the same and it's difficult to judge in advance how severe a road hump might be. Those in Sandy High Street are a case in point – the hump outside of St Swithun's Church is seriously severe and yet the preceding one is hardly noticed. Mead End, Biggleswade must be the worst street in Bedfordshire – the raised ramp on the junction outside of Holmead School is the worst I've ever come across</p> <p>My experience is that as a traffic calming exercise road humps are much more of a nuisance than a benefit – if aimed at curbing streetracers then those folk are only going to see road humps as part of the 'fun' – especially if the vehicle is stolen...</p>	Speed reduction measures are an integral element of encouraging walking and cycling and making a safer environment for all road users and the most appropriate measure would be developed on a scheme by scheme area by area basis. With consultation with the surrounding community.
Cllr Alan Winter 9 th June 2010	<p>Road humps – take them all away – As a bus driver I do my best to cause serious discomfort to my passengers – but no two road humps are the same and it's difficult to judge in advance how severe a road hump might be. Those in Sandy High Street are a case in point – the hump outside of St Swithun's Church is seriously severe and yet the preceding one is hardly noticed. Mead End, Biggleswade must be the worst street in Bedfordshire – the raised ramp on the junction outside of Holmead School is the worst I've ever come across</p> <p>My experience is that as a traffic calming exercise road humps are much more of a nuisance than a benefit – if aimed at curbing streetracers then those folk are only going to see road humps as part of the 'fun' – especially if the vehicle is stolen...</p>	Speed reduction measures are an integral element of encouraging walking and cycling and making a safer environment for all road users and the most appropriate measure would be developed on a scheme by scheme area by area basis. With consultation with the surrounding community.
Miriam 8 th June 2010	<p>Cycle lanes. Street lighting for safe walking. Efficient & reasonably priced public transport</p> <p>Congestion on the A5 and Dunstable town centre – too many traffic lights through Dunstable!</p>	Noted. These comments will be fed into the process for the development of the LATP for Dunstable. Thank you.



Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
Mike 8 th June 2010	Try repairing the damage and repainting on road traffic markings	Immediate maintenance issues can be reported to the Highways Helpdesk. For
Clive C 8 th June 2010	<p>Amphill is a nice place to live but the condition of the pavements from Oliver Street to the town centre are terrible. They have a significant camber to them and are very poorly repaired.</p> <p>An additional issue is the lack of pavements and/or cycle lanes on certain roads. There is no pavement at all from the Tidy Tip in Oliver Street down to the Maulden/ Flitwick Road. There are no pavements at all from the outskirts of Flitwick to the outskirts of Maulden. These should be provided in order to make walking safer.</p> <p>The road from Amphill to Bedford could easily be provided with a combined pavement/cycle path to encourage cycling. This road is extremely dangerous to walk or cycle along.</p>	<p>Noted. Immediate maintenance issues can be reported to the Highways Helpdesk.</p> <p>Your other suggestions would be of great benefit when creating the Amphill Local Area Transport Plan which will begin development in 2011, this will enable the creation of more localised improvements.</p>
Chris 8 th June 2010	<p>A co-ordinate bus and rail timetable – Dunstable is served by THREE different bus companies and none of their timetables are co-ordinated to work together</p> <p>Rail link to Luton and Leighton Buzzard</p> <p>No proper bypass for Dunstable and no rail link to the main lines. Every day I try to drive through the town to the rail station in Luton – madness!</p> <p>I live in Dunstable and our challenge is fighting against the incursion that Luton makes in to our lives. The town is rapidly becoming a ghost town – it needs a by-pass, it needs the high street, pedestrianising, it needs the car park charges removed for short stay (2 hours should do it!), it needs the rents on shops reduced so that people can open new shops and it needs Central Beds to be man enough to stand up to Luton and say NO to the proposed guided bus-way</p>	<p>Noted. Public transport information improvements will be a priority of the LTP.</p> <p>The LATP for Dunstable will also support the masterplan in terms of transport and regeneration.</p>
Barbara 8 th June 2010	Footpaths need to be easier to walk along with a buggy particularly near the town centre	Noted. Access issues are an integral element of the LTP and local plans. We will also work with operator to help

Name/Date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	Easier to access buses if you have a buggy Cost of using a bus more frequent services	achieve improvements where economically possible.
Jenny 8 th June 2010	more frequent services i work shifts and cannot get to work on time using public transport Congestion & infreqesnt public transport	Noted. The LTP will ascertain measures to help improve access to the main employment areas. The LATP will also help to demonstrate specific schemes in and around Dunstable.
Robert 8 th June 2010	Keeping the streets clear of glass to prevent tyre punctures	Immediate maintenance issues can be reported to the Highways Helpdesk
Dave 8 th June 2010	Make using a bus easier in terms of finding the information of where to travel to and where buses go etc Accident reduction (causes a lot of the congestion on way to work) Cars parking outside the school	Noted. Access to schools is an element of the LTP as is road safety and accident reduction.

Exhibitions , Community and wider stakeholder meetings.

Name/date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
Anon. Shared Space 'Talk' – Dunstable 22 Nov	Unsure whether shared space would be suitable within the rural areas.	There are good examples of how shared space has been used in the rural communities. However when the Local Area Transport Plan begins development within your area the most suitable solutions will be sought in consultation with yourselves and the local community.
Anon. Shared Space 'Talk' – Dunstable 22 Nov	I understand that Shared Space could be expensive; however we should ensure that shared space is incorporated into new developments.	Noted. Support for this is in the LTP.



Name/date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
Anon. Shared Space 'Talk' – Dunstable 22 Nov	I am still worried about the safety implications of shared space.	Noted. It will be up to the authority to consult and engage effectively with the local community so that any fears around safety could be eased. Every scheme is also assessed in terms of safety and through each stage of development.
Anon. Shared Space 'Talk' – Dunstable 22 Nov	After the talk I feel more comfortable with the concept but I still have worries about how people with sight difficulties would cope.	Noted. It will be up to the authority to consult and engage effectively with the local community so that any fears around safety could be eased. Every scheme is also assessed in terms of safety and through each stage of development. In particular we will work with local disability charities.
Anon. Shared Space 'Talk' – Dunstable 22 Nov	Great idea. We must have this concept in the centre of Dunstable.	Noted. Thankyou.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (Busway, Masterplan & LTP) 18 Sept	No bus lanes. Car spaces in place of bus lanes	Access for all modes of transport must be sought in order to ease congestion and enable vehicle access. The most appropriate traffic management methods will be proposed on a scheme by scheme basis and full consultation will take place.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	We need 4-sided bus shelters everywhere as a top priority. No one will leave their car behind in order to sit on an uncomfortable seat, in a cold draughty bus shelter. They would rather chug along in a traffic queue in their car.	Improving public transport provision is a priority of the LTP and as such we will be working with operators and other interested parties to improve infrastructure.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	Please don't penalise law abiding bus users in an attempt to deter vandals	Bus stop – as part of the LTP recommendations we will be looking at ways of better managing our infrastructure.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition	Buses that run on time would be helpful	As part of the LTP recommendations the authority will be working with the bus operators to establish economic

Name/date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
(18 Sept)		ways of improving services. Also improving the network management would help to improve bus journey times, which is an initiative within the LTP.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	Take the ‘conservation image’ of High St. Nth. into the Quadrant Centre rather than the ‘modernist concept’ out onto the High St. Nth.	This is related to the Masterplan Development and has been passed to the relevant officer.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	‘Bin the Guided Busway’ – far more expensive than a train link a train link could link to Leighton Buzzard – Midlands. Great links <u>NB</u> – Cambridge Busway built by the same contractor – is it having problems? Who wants this - Luton? Certainly not Dunstable.	The guided busway project was determined to be the most cost effective and flexible way of improving public transport for the area.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	Dr-trunk the A5 and use Berkhamsted as the parking model. Allow cars to park outside the shops in bays – look what it did for Berkhamsted!	There are plans to de-trunk the A5 once the A5-M1 link occurs.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	Put the Market back at the Clock Tower	This is more directly linked to the master plan and has been passed to the appropriate officer.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	People in Dunstable have money to spend, but nowhere to spend it. Everyone goes to Milton Keynes; we want more shops not houses.	This is more directly linked to the master plan and has been passed to the appropriate officer. However the LTP will support the aims of the masterplan and help improve the economic viability of the town through transport.
Dunstable Resident – Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	Shops should pay a percentage of their tanking as rent, and this would encourage more business into the town.	This is more directly linked to the master plan and has been passed to the appropriate officer. However the LTP will support the aims of the masterplan and help improve the economic viability of the town through transport.
Local resident Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	Busway – Hatters Road, can we correct cycling before rest of work	The busway will do much to improve cycling within the town and will have a dedicated cycle lane running parallel to the track. Your specific comments are useful and we



Name/date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
		have included provision within the LATP for Dunstable to ensure facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are improved particularly in providing critical links to interchanges such as the busway.
Representative from Dunstable and District Association of Senior Citizens Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	A Shopmobility scheme would provide the following. Somewhere for the several local firms who make mobility equipment to advertise their wares for a small fee. One full-time job and 2 part-time jobs A forward looking scheme in view of the increasing longevity of the population. Easier accessibility to disabled equipment than the disability Resource Centre which is not on a bus route. Send the message you don't need to go to Milton Keynes, St Albans and Luton to shop, if you are elderly.	This is more directly linked to the master plan and has been passed to the appropriate officer. However the LTP will support the aims of the masterplan and help improve the economic viability of the town through transport.
Representative from Dunstable and District Association of Senior Citizens Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	Bus Route maps not just timetables, available at library, Priory House and Council Notice Boards.	Noted. Very good point and we can advise that the LTP has set a priority for improving information provision and access to information.
Local Resident Houghton Regis Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	Focus on specialist shops in Centre rather than trying to compete with larger towns London etc.	This is more directly linked to the master plan and has been passed to the appropriate officer. However the LTP will support the aims of the masterplan and help improve the economic viability of the town through transport.
Local Resident Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	No bus at the end off Jesus Way please	
Local Resident Joint Project exhibition (18 Sept)	No. 23 Barnfield – ticketing – cash not accepted Attitude of drivers	The LTP is committed to improving public transport and we will work with operators to achieve this where economically viable. Ticketing is amongst the recommended initiatives.

Name/date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
Community Meeting Feb 2010	Buses do not operate in the evenings or on Sunday, I am elderly and this is when many functions are on but I cannot get to them.	The LTP is committed to improving public transport particularly for the elderly, however improvements must be within financial restraints.
Community Meeting Feb 2010	The buses in Dunstable are often held up trying to pull into the bus 'station' and if they cant get in due to the congestion they will just not pull in and continue their journey. The facilities are very poor but this is more notable in the town centre and there are not even any timetables on display. Because there is not a decent size bus station when travelling into town if I want to go to go on somewhere else I have to go through the town. Access within the downside estate is very poor for buses.	The LTP is committed to improving public transport and we will work with operators to achieve this where economically viable. Ticketing is amongst the recommended initiatives.
Community Meeting Feb 2010	It costs me nearly £5 to get to the council offices in town and home again. I have been told there is no return fair system or day ticket.	The LTP is committed to improving public transport and we will work with operators to achieve this where economically viable. Ticketing is amongst the recommended initiatives.
Community Meeting Feb 2010	Trying to access onto some buses is very difficult with a buggy and walking into the town particularly close to the town centre is difficult because of the state of the pavements,	The LTP is committed to improving public transport and we will work with operators to achieve this where economically viable. Ticketing is amongst the recommended initiatives.
Community Meeting Feb 2010	Cycling and walking around the downside estate is difficult due to the number of cars and safety for pedestrians. There are also often lots of glass on the estate which makes it bad for riding a bike	There are a number of projects that have been done and are in the process of being completed that looks at access within the Downside Estate. Provision has been made within the LATP for Dunstable/Houghton Regis to help facilitate the access of buses and pedestrians and cyclists.
Biggleswade Town Council & Town Centre Partnership September– November 2010	A number of detailed discussions took place with regards to transport requirements and the main ambition was to facilitate growth to the East of the Town and support the Biggleswade Masterplan.	The LTP has priorities to support town centre masterplans, further more the LATP for Biggleswade will be developed with these points in mind.



Name/date	Summary of Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
Houghton Regis Town and Parish Council meetings June 2010	The main emphasis for Houghton Regis would be to support the town centre masterplan, improve the town centre, help facilitate growth on the outskirts to help enhance facilities and improve local amenities also look at improvements to the Houghton Road pavements and safety of children.	Noted, these points will be addressed through the LTP and emerging LATP.
Dunstable Town and Parish Councillors June 2010	Support the regeneration of the town and the master plan.	Noted, these points will be addressed through the LTP and emerging LATP.
Dunstable Town Centre management group October 2010	Support for the Masterplan, improvements to public transport infrastructure, continuation of engagement, in general like shared space.	Noted all are elements of the LATP and we intend to build on engaging the public and local community throughout the design and implementation stages of the LATP schemes.
Leighton Linlade Town and Parish council & the Sustainable transport committee meetings - Feb 2010, July, August 2010 & Jan 2011	<p>The LATP needs to take account of the Big Plan, car parking, extension of 20MPH outside morrison's, help sustain cycling and walking success help improve links to the station.</p> <p>Latest Jan meeting – Hockliffe St scheme to be aimed at safety and enabling use for all modes rather than shared space</p>	Noted. Where agreement with local CBC councillors inclusion will be made in the LATP.

Youth Parliament Workshop – August 2010

Question	Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
What are the transport issues that affect you?	<p>Public Transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus and Train fares are too expensive • Frequency of buses • Personal safety on public transport is concerning • Conditions on board buses are not always very nice (dirty, smelly, generally unpleasant) • Buses add to congestion of town centres at peak travel times • Would like to see quality bus shelters • Existing bus shelters to be better maintained • Bus timetables should be up-to-date 	The LTP is committed to improving public transport and we will work with operators to achieve this where economically viable.

Question	Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LAMP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be good if there was some kind of bus update service for families (especially for school transport services) Age discrimination on buses Bus drivers not stopping at bus stops The cost of travelling by bus Safety issues “drunk people on buses” Bus drivers that don’t let guide dogs on the bus There needs to be a concessionary bus fare scheme particularly for young people. 	
	<p>Smarter Choices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A website where you can get all of the information about transport options or that will point you in the right direction to find this information. Information about transport available is VERY important 	The LTP supports measures to improve information provision and particularly with regards to using Information Technology.
	<p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety outside schools Need School Crossing Patrols for longer periods especially to help with pupils attending after school activities 	Encouraging more sustainable methods of travelling to school is a priority within the LTP and as such there will be a programme of local improvements to try and make the journey safer.
	<p>Demand Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More parking enforcement needed Poor parking around schools Congestion around schools at picking up and dropping off times Pot holes Off-road parking Commuter parking Cars parking over two spaces 	As part of the LTP there will be the creation of a parking strategy which will look at these issues.
What should we be focussing on?	<p>Public Transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus driver training – bus drivers should be more kind and polite Improving the image of buses Frequency and comfort of buses Buses using bio-fuels Free Wi-Fi on buses 	The LTP is committed to improving public transport and we will work with operators to achieve this where economically viable



Question	Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An image campaign for buses • Quality bus-shelters 	
	<p>Smarter Choices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing better information to people – posting paper timetables through local doors • Student ID cards for discounted fares • Possible pilot of a half-cost week to emphasize the need for lower prices and would hopefully give an increase in customers • On and off-peak fares • A cycle to school scheme • Smart cards/Oyster cards • Easier to use info • Debit/credit card system • Travel info shop • Create an awareness of cycling • Information on the internet and mobile phones 	<p>All of these measures are excellent examples of smarter choices initiatives and will be considered on a scheme by scheme basis in line with what is economically viable.</p>
	<p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More cycle paths and footpaths on the side of roads • Real-time information • More and improved cycling infrastructure • More pedestrian crossings and in the right locations 	<p>Noted. these initiatives are supported within the LTP and many form part of planned initiatives within the LATP's</p>
	<p>Demand Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing the network better • Speed restriction measures • Off-road parking (Flitwick) • Parking at train stations • Pot holes 	<p>Noted. these initiatives are supported within the LTP and many form part of planned initiatives within the LATP's</p>

Question	Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No flowers at crash sites – cars to stop to lay flowers at usually dangerous sites • More cycle lanes on main roads • More off-road cycle lanes • Reducing pedestrian conflicts with cycles • More parking enforcement • Control traffic speeds where pedestrians want to cross (town centre, near schools etc) • Bus gates • Less traffic in town centres 	
How would you like to be travelling in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One place (website) where we could go to find all information about travel. Including discounts, funding for 6th form travel and concessionary fares • Buses using bio-fuels • On and off peak fares • More cycle lanes on main roads • More off-road cycle lanes • Packed buses • More car-sharing • Better managed roads • Lower public transport costs • Easy to use, updated bus timetables • More female taxi-drivers • Trams • More reliable passenger transport • Electric and hydrogen fuel cell cars • Fewer cars in town centres • Better and clearer information • Public transport needs to dominate • Better frequency of buses and more direct • Cycle hire scheme 	Noted. Some of these initiatives are supported within the LTP and many form part of planned initiatives within the LATP's, some initiatives mentioned would not be economically suitable however there are some positive ideas for how we will be travelling in the future.



Question	Issue	Response <i>Note: LTP = Local Transport Plan & LATP = Local Area Transport Plan.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car clubs • More cycle routes • Remove guard railings • Fewer emissions • No new roads • Re-nationalisation of buses • Safer cycling • Environmentally friendly and low-emissions transport • Less car dependency 	

DRAFT

Attendees

Group 1

Jim Tombe – Central Bedfordshire Council
Richard Crane – Bedford to Bletchley Rail Users Association
John Henderson – Railfuture
Andrew Long – Bedford Commuters Association
Drew Merchant – Renaissance Bedford
Peter Williams – Bedford Area Bus Users Society

Group 2

James Gleave – Central Bedfordshire Council
Malcolm Burgoyne – Bedford to Bletchley Rail Users Association
Peter Hirst – Bedford Area Bus Users Society
Melanie MadLeod – Bedford Borough Council
Helen Marshall – East of England Development Agency
Martin Parker – Railfuture

Group 3

Ben King – Central Bedfordshire Council
Simon Deards – Bedford Borough Council
Stephen Sleight – Bedfordshire Rural Transport Partnership
Arthur Taylor – Bedford Commuters Association
Peter Wakfield – Railfuture

Workshop 1 – What is the biggest transport issue facing Central Bedfordshire?

Public Transport

- Lack of coherent public transport network with no connections between buses and trains
- There is a need for a Bus Quality Partnership in Central Beds. Intalink in Hertfordshire is a good example of partnership working
- Poor quality information at bus stops
- Need to understand people's travel patterns
- Integrated ticketing
- More direct buses are needed, not stopping at every village
- Approach for buses needs to be:
 - Provide direct bus services
 - Market and promote them
 - Improve the supporting infrastructure
- Lack of patronage on local buses, and lack of information on buses
- Buses do not link to transport interchanges
- Need to improve access to rail stations
- Lack of layover space for buses
- Challenge is to provide a decent public transport service in a rural area
- Poor bus information, with a lack of timetables at stops
- Poor co-ordination between modes, particularly bus and rail. Better to push for bus-rail integration
- Improve facilities at rail stations
- Publicity and information is key to public transport services
- Contribution to guided busway means there is no money for works in Mid Bedfordshire
- Some bus services run too close together (e.g. Flitwick). Buses are not co-ordinated!
- Better Sunday and Bank Holiday services
- Deliver East-West Rail
- Rail use is growing – encourage it



- Bus reliability is important

Walking and Cyding

- Free parking doesn't encourage people to walk or cycle
- Walking and cyding needs to be more enjoyable. Focus on leisure!
- Improve access to railway stations by walking and cyding
- Better and more secure cycle infrastructure and parking needed
- Improve the rights of way network
- Do not mix buses and bikes in bus lanes
- Cycle tracks – more are needed
- Reduce street clutter

Other issues

- Should accept that Central Beds is a commuter area and plan for it
- East/West Rail is needed and safeguard future rail lines
- A council commitment is needed to sustainable travel
- Growth can be good or bad depending upon how its managed. Transport links need to be in on the first day
- Air quality
- High car ownership
- No major towns or service centres or major industry – a feeder area and a place people travel through
- Commuter parking is a major issue in larger towns – lack of enforcement and TROs
- Improve access to healthcare facilities
- Culture of taking children to school by car
- Poor maintenance of highways and verges
- Congestion, particularly in the towns
- Central Beds should not have been created as an administrative entity. Makes no transport sense
- CBC is east-west, but links are north-south
- Work with neighbours much more closely

Workshop 2 – What can be done to encourage more people to walk, cycle, and use public transport, given our constraints?

- Need to understand the potential for these modes first – how many people work within 2 miles of home?
- Need to address the habits of people, but can't force them to change behaviour
- Health and cost arguments needs to be stressed, particularly comparative costs
- Cycling infrastructure needs to be improved
- Roll out Station Travel Plans – they are working well and at limited cost
- Work with schools to make the most of their Travel Plans
- Lack of funding is not an excuse
- Better maps of the public transport network
- Improved ticketing, particularly integrated ticketing
- Better cycle links and improved infrastructure for cycle repairs
- Fill in the gaps in the network, notably improved east-west links and the cycle network
- Work in partnership with neighbouring authorities
- Increase parking fees to encourage the use of buses
- A series of promotions for sustainable travel needed – discounts, smart cards etc.
- Secure cycle parking
- Cycleway improvements needed
- Reduce speed limits to 20mph in urban areas
- Off-road shared foot and cydeways with a route hierarchy
- Bus service quality and reliability needs improving
- Bus stop infrastructure needs improving – facilities



- Focus on demographics for bus patronage
- Promote PlusBus
- Provide better information on all modes including interchange
- Cycle parking at rail stations
- Comprehensive network of cycle routes
- Need safe, well-lit environment to walk in
- Deliver real time bus running information
- Improve facilities for cycling at rail station
- Outsource transport functions of the authority
- Green cycle grid is needed
- Need to set up meetings with bus and rail operators

Workshop 3 – If you could do one thing to improved transport in your area, what would it be?

- Car share scheme for Central Bedfordshire Council
- Buses to run later
- Workplace parking levies (so long as an alternative is in place)
- Buses need to run later
- Encourage more home working and shopping via the internet
- Improve the whole journey
- Do not worry about congestion – it can encourage people to use more sustainable travel
- Bus Quality Partnerships
- Secure matched funding from rail companies
- Improve maintenance of road network
- Make bus services run later
- Improve joined-up thinking between public authorities
- Approach needs to be information, integration, and co-ordination
- Safeguard old railways

Other Consultation

As demonstrated in the previous section we also conducted a House holder Questionnaire and numerous public consultation events. Both of these elements were quite extensive pieces of work and the results from these exercise were used to inform both the LTP and the related Local Area Transport Plan programmes. The report for the householder questionnaire is substantial is size and is therefore available upon request from the Transport Strategy team. The report for the consultation exercise is available as **Appendix 1**.



Cycling Strategy: Consultation Feedback

This note forms a summary of the key points raised during the consultation on the Cycling Strategy element of the Local Transport Plan entitled, 'More People Cycling: A Strategy for Central Bedfordshire'. Consultation was undertaken on the Strategy with stakeholders between 5 July 2010 and 9 August 2010.

The main issues highlighted through the consultation and how they have been addressed within the Strategy itself are set out in the table below.

Issue	Amendments to Strategy
Improved definition and description of the role of the National Cycle Network in the network hierarchy is required.	Revised definition of the NCN is provided and any implied relationship with National Byways removed.
Policy statement CS2 is ambiguous because it states that urban routes will be prioritised which is at odds with placing national and regional routes at the top of the network hierarchy.	Hierarchy has been revised, removing reference to the NCN and national/regional routes, to re-focus on the relative priority to be given to urban/rural routes.
Local routes are more important to most people than national routes	
Consideration should be given to including quiet roads, lanes and streets within the other categories of the network hierarchy.	Hierarchy revised and reference to quiet routes incorporated into new categories.
Promotion of quiet roads, lanes and streets higher up the hierarchy.	
The vision for cycling should be more ambitious.	Felt that the vision represents a realistic and stretching ambition for the authority.
Types of cyclists should be better defined in terms of ability, journey purpose etc.	Additional column included within the network hierarchy to highlight the types of cyclists the particular element of the network is tailored towards.
The Local Area Agreement targets will be out of date by the time of adoption of the strategy and should be updated.	Inclusion of the LAA table has been removed and a greater focus placed on cycling specific targets.
Cycling should not be stated to merely 'assist' in the delivery of the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Stronger wording should be used.	Reworded to reflect the important role of sustainable transport in the delivery of the strategy.



Issue	Amendments to Strategy
Promotion of cycling helps to combat more than just obesity and this should be reflected in the strategy	Reference included to the range of health benefits derived from cycling.
Consideration should be given to the Bike It campaign and the Active Travel Projects in Bedford and Luton which could be extended to parts of Central Beds.	Reference to these projects has been included within the marketing section of areas of intervention.
The targets included within the Strategy should be ambitious including a 100% increase in the level of cycle flow on the network and increase in children cycling to school from 1.8% to 40%.	The targets included in the Strategy are thought to be realistic but stretching.
Should mention the 20mph zones which have been set up in Leighton and the on-road carriageway markings for cyclists.	Reference made to various road safety measures including 20mph limits. Only a certain number of examples can be included however.
No reference to how increasing the numbers of cyclists increases safety.	Section added drawing out the benefits to safety of more cyclists on the network.
Include reference of the need to work with drivers to increase awareness of cyclists including lorries and bus operators	Whilst the benefits of this are recognised, the strategy will not prioritise general driver training due to the financial constraints facing the authority.
The KSI target should be recorded by mile so that the target is rate based and not skewed by increases / decreases in cycling.	It is not possible to accurately determine the number of miles travelled across the authority by bike and hence the established methodology of reviewing casualty reduction will be applied.
Strategy should more accurately reflect the positive role cycling can play in rural tourism	Reference to the importance of cycle tourism is included within the SWOT analysis, the wider context in terms of its contribution to economic growth and within the leisure links level of the network hierarchy.
Include reference to Greensand Ridge Local Development Strategy and a specific policy for the role of cycling as a tourist pursuit	Section included on the Greensand Ridge Development Strategy and the role of the Local Action Group in delivering the overall objectives of the Strategy.
Should be continued commitment to providing maps for free to encourage ease of access	This is incorporated within the information provision policy of the Strategy.
Set a target for increasing the number of leisure trips	Hard to accurately monitor the number of leisure related trips. Due to the need to minimise the level of monitoring undertaken a specific target along these lines will not be included.



Issue	Amendments to Strategy
Section on best practice could be amalgamated with infrastructure interventions	Chapter has been reordered to better relate the interventions and areas of best practice.
Appears to be little reference to LTN 02/08 which sets out the standards for cycle design infrastructure.	[Steve to address]
Reference should be made to nationally acceptable design standards in terms of new infrastructure	[Steve to address]
Graphics on the front cover do not communicate that it is a cycling strategy	The strategy is branded consistently with all of the other LTP3 documents.
Uncertainty as to how often the strategy will be reviewed. Would like an annual report	Will be reviewed on an annual basis as part of the LTP as a whole and this has been drawn out in the introduction.
Lack of reference to Cycle Stand and how the vision and approach has been adopted from the previous cycling strategy for the county.	Reference included to the objectives of the previous cycling strategy and how these will be embraced by this document.
Some of the urban areas are not mentioned in terms of their cycling provision.	All detail on individual towns cycling provision has been removed from the strategy as it is felt that it is most appropriately included within the Local Area Transport Plans.
No indication as to the completeness of the routes of national or regional importance	Reference to routes has been removed.
The journey purpose approach appears to neglect other types of trips such as leisure.	Leisure trips are addressed in the Access to Services Strategy together with education, retail and healthcare trips to ensure that all journey purposes are addressed in the high level strategies.
Town centre permeability policy is weak and should place a stronger focus on cyclists.	Policy has been revised to add greater weight to the needs of cyclists.
Minimum standards should be established for the maintenance of the cycle network. Needs further thought.	[Insert]
Disagreement over the prioritisation of urban schools benefitting from cycle route improvements.	The LTP in general will focus on the areas of growth in the authority and as a consequence urban schools in growth areas will be prioritised in the provision of cycle enhancement schemes.
Offering cycle training to pupils is a weak policy and should be replaced by a fimer approach, whilst reference should also be made to Bikeability.	Reference to Bikeability is already included. However it is felt that offering training to children is an appropriate policy. The authority can not force children to undertake training.



Issue	Amendments to Strategy
Cycle purchase scheme policy should be renamed as a cycle access policy to reflect other initiatives to increase access to a bike. Should also promote a recycling scheme for bicycles	Policy has been renamed and reworded to reflect the wider sweep of measures which may be undertaken locally. Felt that a recycling scheme for bicycles is unlikely to be developed in the near future so reference has been omitted.
Firmer policy is required on the requirement for travel plans	The thresholds for which travel plans will be required are set out and provide a firm commitment on behalf of the authority to secure such plans through the planning process.
Explore opportunities for dual purpose cycle parking, where it is incorporated into other street furniture.	Detailed cycling parking considerations are set out in Appendix C on Cycle Parking.
Parking at transport hubs should be explored in the strategy.	Reference added to the need to prioritise cycle parking at transport interchanges.
Can planning policy be changed to enable cycle storage to be provided at the front of properties without the need for planning permission?	This is outside of the scope of the Strategy and the authority as a whole. Planning policy is established at the national level and details of 'permitted development' which does not require planning permission is included within the General Permitted Development Order 2010.
What is the commitment to the layout of segregated use tracks? It is not clear in the strategy.	The draft infrastructure toolkit in the appendix sets out the authority's policy on this and states that shared use footways will not be segregated.

Other Consultation

As demonstrated in the previous section we also conducted a House holder Questionnaire and numerous public consultation events. Both of these elements were quite extensive pieces of work and the results from these exercise were used to inform both the LTP and the related Local Area Transport Plan programmes. The report for the householder questionnaire is substantial in size and is therefore available upon request from the Transport Strategy team. The report for the consultation exercise is available as **Appendix 1**.



Section 2 – Draft LTP: Engagement responses



Section 2: LTP responses (All)

Name	Issue	Response
The Wildlife Trust, 23/02/11	<p>RE: Central Bedfordshire's Local Transport Plan 3 – Draft (January 2011 Version 110105)</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Habitat Regulations Assessment that accompanies the draft Central Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3). We would like to provide comments on both the Habitat Regulations Assessment and on LTP3 as there are some issues which concern us.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations Assessment</p> <p>The scope of Habitat Regulation Assessments is to only consider Natura 2000 sites. As the Assessment correctly identifies there are none of these in Central Bedfordshire although there are some in surrounding counties. We are satisfied that this document adequately considers the potential impacts on these sites. Beyond the scope of the Assessment, however, LTP3 contains schemes that would have large negative impacts on the environment and sites designated for their importance to biodiversity. Our concerns about these schemes are discussed below.</p> <p>Woodside Connection</p> <p>From the consultation in January/February 2009 Option 1 of the Woodside Connection is shown as the preferred route on the Major Schemes Map on page 82 of the LTP3 and is also the preferred option in the Core Strategy for this area. The Wildlife Trust supports the choice of this route as it avoids the nationally significant habitats and species which are found in Houghton Regis Quarry. This site is a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and contains Houghton Regis Marl Lakes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The marl lakes, fens and lowland</p>	<p>Agreed. The LTP3 has been amended to reflect the Core Strategy in terms of the Luton Northern Bypass.</p> <p>Full assessments including HRA's will be undertaken as part of the major projects themselves and will thus provide more detailed information and assessment.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>calcareous grassland within the quarry are all national priority Biodiversity Action Plan habitats. They support important assemblages of dragonflies, butterflies and birds, as well as great crested newts.</p> <p>Luton Northern Bypass</p> <p>The Vision for LTP3 is to '<i>enhance the unique character of our communities and environment by creating an integrated transport system that is safe, sustainable and accessible for all</i>'. We are very concerned that it contains plans to create a Luton Northern Bypass which would have a negative impact on the environment. As we advised in response to the Bypass consultation in January/February 2009 and at various stages in the development of the Core Strategy, all of the bypass options would have huge adverse impacts on biodiversity and the landscape and they should not be considered further. The pre-submission version of the Luton and South Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy (November 2010) no longer proposed the section of the Luton Northern Bypass east of the A6. LTP3 should align closely with the Core Strategy¹ and not contain substantial differences such as this one. All the route options which were initially considered are shown on the Major Schemes Map on page 82 of LTP3, including those which would be the most damaging. None of the bypass options for the north of Luton could be constructed without a huge adverse impact on biodiversity. The table on the following page lists the designated sites which would be affected by each route option. It does not take into account the area of each site which would be affected; in some cases whole sites would be destroyed.</p>	

¹ Draft Local Transport Plan 3 page 10

Name	Issue			Response
	Bypass Option	Designated Sites Directly on the Route	Additional Designated Sites within ~250m of the Route ²	
	(i) Northern options between both the M1 and A6 and the A6 and A505	Icknield Way CWS	Chalton scrub and grassland CWS Sundon Chalk Pits CWS & SSSI Sundon Wood CWS George Wood, Streatley CWS Galley and Warden Hills CWS Wardswood Lane CWS (Herts) Lilley Park Wood CWS (Herts)	

² Route options were taken from pages 4 and 5 of the North Luton and North Dunstable Transport Proposals consultation document (February 2009), as these are illustrative the table can only be a guide to the designated sites which may be affected.



Name	Issue			Response
	(v) Southern option between the M1 and A6 and middle option between the A6 and A505	Icknield Way CWS Galley and Warden Hills CWS, LNR & SSSI Bradger's Hill CWS	Chalton scrub and grassland CWS Sundon Wood CWS George Wood, Streatley CWS Oosey Hill CWS	
	(vi) Southern options between both the M1 and A6 and the A6 and A505	Icknield Way CWS Galley and Warden Hills CWS, LNR & SSSI Bradger's Hill CWS Honeygate and Crick Hills CWS The Chase CWS	Chalton scrub and grassland CWS Sundon Wood CWS George Wood, Streatley CWS	
<p>SSSI are the country's most important wildlife sites and are legally protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. The proposed northern route option runs to the south of Sundon Chalk Pits SSSI, which is important for its wetland and chalk grassland communities, and all the routes run close to or through Galley and Warden Hills SSSI. As well as being an SSSI, Galley and Warden Hills is also a Local Nature Reserve, CWS and an important open space for the local community. Along with many of the designated sites listed in the table above Galley and Warden Hills is a lowland calcareous grassland. This is a BAP priority habitat because its quantity and quality are in decline nationally³. Bedfordshire is no exception and so the BAP seeks to maintain the existing calcareous grasslands and to restore or create new grasslands to form a network of sites. Some of the other</p>				

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>designated sites in the table, such as Sundon Wood CWS, are ancient woodlands. This is another BAP Priority habitat. As recognised in PPS9, no mitigation can replace ancient woodland once it is destroyed, as age is a vital factor in its importance⁴. All of the sites in the table above are CWS. This means that they have all be designated for their importance to biodiversity when assessed against a set of criteria. Planning Policy Statement 9 recognises the importance of such sites and promotes their protection stating that:</p> <p><i>“Sites of regional and local biodiversity and geological interest, which include Regionally Important Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Local Sites (CWS), have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets; contributing to the quality of life and the well-being of the community; and in supporting research and education.”⁵</i></p> <p>The creation of a Luton Northern Bypass would sever habitat links between these important sites and the surrounding countryside, possibly leading to local extinctions. Small isolated populations of any species are more vulnerable to extinction, especially as the climate changes. To enable species to move in response to climate change and stay within an environment they can tolerate, it is vital that habitat networks are maintained. The proposed Bypass would isolate Galley and Warden Hills from other important calcareous grassland sites around Barton-le-Clay or into Luton. The Bedfordshire BAP is seeking to enhance the connections between these areas which would be permanently divided if a bypass was created. This is supported by PPS9, paragraph 12, which recommends that habitat networks are maintained and strengthened. Pollution associated with the bypass, such as drainage from the road, oil spills and vehicle emissions would also cause degradation to the sites. This would be a particular problem for sites, such as Galley and Warden</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Hills, which would be very close to the road.</p> <p>The numbers of sites that would be degraded or destroyed by the Luton Northern Bypass makes it unacceptable. The Principles of PPS9 clearly state that this harm should be prevented, especially where other options are available:</p> <p><i>“The aim of planning decisions should be to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests. Where granting planning permission would result in significant harm to those interests, local planning authorities will need to be satisfied that the development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative sites that would result in less or no harm”</i></p> <p><i>PPS9 Principles (iv)</i></p> <p>Along with all the sites which are designated for their biodiversity importance the whole landscape around the majority of the proposed bypass is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Local authorities have a legal duty to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB in all that they do⁶. PPS7 states that:</p> <p><i>“Areas of Outstanding National Beauty have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should therefore be given great weight in planning policies and development control decisions in these areas. The conservation of wildlife and the cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas.”</i></p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>The construction of the Luton Northern Bypass would destroy this nationally important landscape. Galley and Warden Hills and the surrounding countryside are highly valued by local people. This Local Nature Reserve is also an important greenspace and the topography means that views of uninterrupted open countryside are quickly reached from the urban area. This adds to the well-being and quality of life of local people. Some routes would sever Galley and Warden Hills and Stopsley Common, another important greenspace, from the urban area making them inaccessible.</p> <p>It is important to note that both the two SSSI and the Chilterns AONB have <u>nationally</u> important designations, with strong planning guidance in both PPS9 and PPS7 respectively, not only for their protection but also for their enhancement. We are not aware of any evidence of the Luton Northern Bypass being any more than a <u>local</u> scheme. The Transport Appraisal which accompanies the Core Strategy states that:</p> <p><i>“7.1.4 A complete outereastern highway route improvement between the A505 and M1 Junction 10 performs more as a ‘bypass’. The additional travel benefits of building the A6-A505 section of the Northern Bypass are marginal overall”</i></p> <p>LTP3 itself also recognises the environmental constraints involved in the creation of a Luton Northern Bypass. It also states that it requires significant enabling development that is unlikely to happen⁷. This is perhaps why the most damaging section east of the A6 has been removed in the latest version of the Core Strategy. The Wildlife Trust objects to the inclusion of the Northern Luton Bypass in LTP3 because of the large adverse effects it would have on biodiversity and the landscape. In order to reflect the Core Strategy, its policies and national planning guidance we suggest that it is removed. As was suggested by many stakeholders during the bypass consultation in January/February 2009, we advise that alternative measures are</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	developed, such as those for public transport that are discussed in other sections of LTP3.	
Public Transport Rep. for Dunstable & District Assoc. of Senior Citizens. 24/02/11	Do not feel that people with mobility issues were adequately represented within the LTP.	<p>The Access to Services report is focused around ensuring access for all road users is taken into account in particular reference to enabling people to access key destinations such as hospitals and supermarkets etc. Furthermore the Equalities Impact Assessment seeks to ensure that our policies specifically take account of different needs and segments of our community.</p> <p>However it is agreed that the LTP and the Access to Services Strategy could be more specific in supporting the needs of those people with mobility issues and as such a number of additions have been made to ensure that our approach is clear and concise.</p>
Bedfordshire Council's Planning Consortium 12/02/11	<p><u>Submission by The Bedfordshire Councils' Planning Consortium to the Consultation Exercise regarding the Draft Local Transport Plan 3 Document</u></p> <p>1) <u>THE CONSULTATION PROCESS</u></p> <p>Most of our members have expressed grave concerns at not only the document consultation process but also the wider consultation process as whole. The end result we feel is a flawed, non-robust, inconsiderate (to consultees) process which is not inclusive. Our justifications for these criticisms are as follows</p> <p>a) Parish Councils (via their Clerks) and other consultees were not written to in advance of the commencement of the wider consultation exercise, explaining what the LTP3 consultation exercise was all about, time scales, how consultees were to collaborate and be involved, what feedback the Transport Strategy team was requesting of its consultees</p>	<p>A campaign of engagement for the LTP has been on-going since the spring of 2010. The aim of the myjourney branding and engagement techniques was to ensure that stakeholders, councilors and the public would be involved with the development of the LTP. Rather than just a reviewing a document that was already written. Furthermore the very nature of the LTP is designed in such a way that enables communities to effectively direct the council on what highways and transport programme they want to see in their areas, this was done and will continue through the development of the Local Area Transport Plans (LATPS).</p> <p>It is regrettable that there was a limited amount of time to allow for reviewing of the Draft LTP, however this timescale was dictated by the issuing of the budget allocation from central government, which was not</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>etc etc in the compilation of data to underpin the new transport policy document. This is surely recognised as the first step in the wider communication process, why was it omitted in this case? Our Parish Council members in particular felt that Central Bedfordshire Council has paid lip service to involving them in the wider consultation process, never having been directly approached until 12th January 2011, when they were made aware of over 1,000 pages of documents, comprising the Draft Plan and Appendices on which the authority was demanding a response in less than one month. One member observed that as far as he was aware, apart from the single stakeholder workshop, the other consultation undertaken has focused on social media facilities such as a blog and web page on www.letstalkcentral.com and a series of market stalls at locations such as Biggleswade and Leighton Buzzard over the summer. There are obvious concerns over this format, LTP3 involves complex issues that are difficult to convey to members of the public in just a few minutes on a market stall and a large proportion of regular public transport users do not have internet access.</p> <p>b) Certain consultees were notified of the commencement of the consultation on the Draft LTP3 document on 6th January, despite promises that the consultation would commence in mid December and then 22nd January. Inexplicably, Parish Councils were not notified until 12th January! Clearly a mistake occurred and, in spite of the question as to why the delay/what went wrong, nobody has received an admission that CBC made a mistake and an apology!</p> <p>c)</p> <p>i) that all consultees are conversant with and have access to the internet.</p> <p>d) We deplore that fact that the consultation on this document</p>	<p>released until December 2010.</p> <p>All communication methods were used throughout the whole of the campaign process including a freepost address, contact telephone numbers and email which were complimented by the social media campaign which helped us to reach out to a larger section of our community.</p> <p>The LTP sets out key areas of intervention (Land use planning, Smarter Choices, New Infrastructure and Services, Network Management and Demand Management). The LTP defines some of the more common and required elements defined as techniques of delivering these intervention methods, however specific intervention measures will be designed through the consultation process for each of the LTP's.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>appears to have focussed on stakeholders and agencies and a few targeted councils in growth areas. This is an authority wide strategy and therefore consultation should have been authority wide. It is clearly not <i>indusive</i> to only include local communities in their own local area transport plans without encouraging and allowing the indusive input of all Parish and Town Councils into the draft framework.</p> <p>2) <u>COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT LTP3 DOCUMENT</u></p> <p>The membership of our organisation recognises that a substantial amount of time and effort has gone into the compilation of the draft document and the appendices and much of the substance of the document is to be applauded and supported. However, we have had the concern expressed that all these grand objectives need funding and nowhere in the document is a warning note of realism sounded that in these very difficult economic times for Local Authorities, delivery of the aims stated may well be unachievable in several instances. In fact, in the case of rural bus service provision, we are likely to see a reduced service from April of this year.</p> <p><u>ANTICIPATED GROWTH</u></p> <p>It particularly concerns our membership in the Northern sector of Central Bedfordshire that housing and jobs growth is still based on the discredited top down approach of the RSS and that no account has been taken of the significant economic downturn this country has and is continuing to suffer, since the East of England Plan figures were published. Instead of a needs based, bottom up approach, as adopted for the Southern sector, the draft LTP3 is basing its traffic growth projections on overly optimistic figures for the Northern sector, which obviously skews the overall growth projections for Central Bedfordshire as a whole.</p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p><u>RURAL COMMUNITY ISSUES</u></p> <p>Whatever the scale of growth over the 15 year period of the Plan, there will inevitably be a significant increase in the number of vehicles on our rural roads. We do not feel that there is recognition in the Plan of the inevitable increases in 'rat running' through our villages and along our country lanes and the inevitable road safety issues, particularly for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There is mention of ways of tackling such safety issues in urban areas but not in the countryside. We feel this should be recognised as an issue of considerable importance and there should therefore be commensurate contingency planning detailed in the document that Parish Councils can request be implemented when necessary.</p> <p><u>QUIET LANES</u></p> <p>The dropping of any reference whatsoever to Quiet Lanes in this Draft LTP document, when its predecessor had a Policy Note on Quiet Lanes built into it, is, we feel, a retrograde step. To use the excuse that as Quiet Lanes were not mentioned in the wider consultation and that this therefore justified their omission is ridiculous. We have already identified the totally inadequate attempt to involve Parish Councils in the consultation prior to the draft document stage. CBC admits that they have a record of at least a dozen Parish Councils which have detailed a lane or lanes in their parish (and were contacted by CBC in February of 2010 to confirm indications of the cost areas in establishing a Quiet Lane) which they feel should be designated Quiet Lanes to protect and encourage <i>shared space</i> for vehicles, cyclists, walkers and horse riders. This concept of 'shared space' is mentioned on Page 66 of the Plan document, but only in an urban context. Surely it should be recognized that it can also apply in the rural environment as well and would it really cause problems to mention the term Quiet Lanes in the document? As Alice Crampin of CPRE Bedfordshire observed, the omission of any reference to Quiet Lanes in the LTP document "seems to sit ill with Green Infrastructure initiatives, and the push towards a greater recognition for quality of life issues and measures. With the growing use of lanes for 'rat-running' to avoid ever increasing</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>congestion on main routes, the need for Quiet Lanes is getting greater."</p> <p>As so much effort has already been expended in establishing the concept of Quiet Lanes in our area, we trust we can rely on common sense to apply. If not, we request a clear commitment from CBC that the lack of specific mention of Quiet Lanes does not preclude their inclusion in the future, be it in LATPs or instigated by a Parish or Town Council.</p> <p><u>TRANSPORT</u></p> <p>There appears to be an oversight re Connectivity (P64-65) as there is no mention of rail services in this section.</p> <p>We would like to see the following addition inserted in the document Section 70 – Access Restriction. As soon as the A5 – M1 link road is completed, HGV access restrictions to be introduced on the A5120 between TheBridleway and the junction with the link road.</p> <p>We would suggest the extension of some bus service to make them more useful and therefore better patronized. For example, if the 42 that runs from Bedford to Toddington ran on to Houghton Regis, it would mean that all the villages that access it (and that's most along the A5120) could then get to the Central Beds Council centre in Houghton Regis which unlike village branch libraries is open all and every working day. [This comment ignores the fact that the service 42 connects at Toddington with Centre Bus service X31 which offers through ticketing between Bedford and Luton, via Houghton Regis and Dunstable. Perhaps this is indicative of a lack of clarity on bus destination boards and timetables.] HR also has good bus links with Luton and Dunstable. Irritatingly, it seems that service providers always want to strip services Beeching-like of their usefulness so e.g. one in three 42 buses bypass Harlington and go straight from Toddington to Westoning (and vice versa). Thus many of our older village residents who use the</p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Toddington doctor's surgery only have a 2 in 3 chance of getting the bus there and back and the valuable connection with Harlington Station for Chalgrave and Toddington passengers is severely reduced.</p> <p>The Bedfordshire Councils' Planning Consortium 11th February 2011</p>	
Chater, 12/02/11 resident	<p><u>Ref: Central Bedfordshire Council LTP Policy. (What I says.aspx)</u></p> <p><u>Appendix K - Biggleswade & Sandy LTP. Page 31, Section 5.6</u></p> <p>With reference to the above, as a Wrestlingworth resident, I write to express considerable concern regarding the apparent lack of planning required to ensure suitable eastern bound "freight" transportation requirements resulting from the excessive development currently under way in Biggleswade and district.</p> <p>Wrestlingworth, like Pottun, is already subjected to a totally unacceptable level of freight traffic from an environmental perspective and should not be expected to cater for any future increase in freight as may be proposed, d. The Wrestlingworth High Street south section of the B1042 with its lack of roadside parking restrictions constitutes a regular day to day likelihood of serious danger to life and any increase or upgrading of vehicle status will inevitably add to this danger. Please consider these points before reaching any final conclusions.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Pottun and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>I would also like to add that we will be working with local communities within the Wrestlingworth area during the development of the East Bedfordshire Local Area Transport Plan which is due to begin development in 2013. This will enable a programme of works to be specifically created to tackle local issues in your</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		<p>community.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Beds RCC 14/02/11	Inclusion of commitment to Wheels to Work Schemes	We have included a case study of the wheels to work scheme in the Access to work strategy.
PDP, legal Counsel. 14/02/11	<p>This Plan has recently been brought to my attention, and as a resident of Wrestlingworth I am very concerned by the proposal to make the B1042 a secondary freight route. The B1042 winds its way through several small picturesque villages, past village schools and play areas, around tight corners with little visibility and is not at all suitable for such a purpose. You say that the intention of this proposal is to minimise impact on local communities and town centres, but what about rural local communities and village centres? Town centres are inevitably busy already - why not keep the traffic there and off the unsuitable country roads?</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your response.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>I would also like to add that we will be working with local communities within the Wrestlingworth area during the development of the East Bedfordshire Local Area</p>

Name	Issue	Response
		<p>Transport Plan which is due to begin development in 2013. This will enable a programme of works to be specifically created to tackle local issues in your community.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
<p>Harlington Parish Council 12/02/11</p>	<p>Harlington Parish Council has reviewed the Local Transport Plan 3 - My Journey document and has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 103 pages is an awful lot to go through, especially when it takes 37 pages before one finds what the LTP objectives are. Whatever happened to the executive style summary that was discussed a couple of years ago that allows the reader to get the overall concepts of the consultation sorted and then dip into the detail where appropriate? A longer consultation period would have allowed meaningful discussion at Parish Council level. Overall, as a broad strategy, it is very sensible, with clear objectives. Wording of the document is clear and easy to understand. The key themes of 'integration' and 'sustainability' come through strongly. However <ul style="list-style-type: none"> links to Appendix G - Public Transport Information Strategy (of particular relevance to Harlington) and Appendix H - Car Parking Strategy appear to be missing on the site; There are not enough details on what, and how and when it will be achieved, and where the money will come from; Maps in the document are not clear, nor in enough detail, even when enlarged. The term 'Kiss and Ride' site (page 76) is inappropriate; and 	<p>Thank you very much for the comments that you sent through on behalf of Harlington Parish Council. We have taken time to consider these comments, and our response to the relevant comments is set out below:</p> <p>Consultation on Local Transport Plan - Whilst we understand that the timescales for comments on the main LTP3 Strategy were shorter than desired, there has been extensive consultation on LTP3 in its development. Directly relevant to Parish Councils is our attendance at the June 2010 Town and Parish Council conference, and being invited to provide feedback on LTP3 via Let's Talk Central as well as more traditional means such as email or letter. In the future, we will be developing a Local Area Transport Plan for the Harlington area, and common to the approach that we have taken in developing the existing Local Area Transport Plans we shall be working closely with local Town and Parish Councils in developing the plans. We look forward to working with Harlington Parish Council in the development of your area's LATP during 2011/12.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under 'Major Schemes' there is mention of a 'Flitwick-Westoning' bypass (page 80), but no further details could be found. ▪ It is an ambitious plan cost wise, particularly with current cost cutting, removal of rural bus services and the building of new homes in future. Has enough capacity been built in? ▪ 'Enable access to health care' needs to be a major priority. With no hospitals in Central Beds it is unacceptable that there is a 46 minute journey by public transport when it is a 30 minute national average (page 23). With the 85+ population doubling by 2031, and an increased population from the 22,500 new houses in South Beds, there will also need to be very speedy road access to hospitals for emergencies. [Although not directly related to a transport plan, are there any plans to build a new hospital in Central Beds?]. ▪ Under 'Out Commuting Trips' page 45, it mentions that 1 in 20 of all jobs are in London and this is greater in rural areas. Then on page 84 it mentions that Luton North Station may entail the closing of Harlington or Leagrave Stations. So how would these 'rural' commuters get into London? ▪ Harlington appears to be on a Designated Road Freight Network as a Secondary Freight Route (page 72). ▪ M1 Junction 11A and the new road links should take some of the traffic away from M1 Junction 12, which is good, but the timeframe and funding for Junction 11A is not clear. ▪ In Appendix D - Freight, Ampthill and Flitwick are shown as Minor Service Centres under 'Growth Areas'. No specific details are given. What does this entail? ▪ Also in Appendix D Sundon is mentioned as a suitable area for a rail freight terminal. There is no transport plan, or new roads mentioned if this were to happen. Is there money available for it? Life in Sundon would be irrevocably changed with increased noise and traffic not only from the rail freight terminal, but also the Luton Northern Bypass. <p>Harlington has concerns of over development all around it which is perceived as not being part of the plan for the village – surely an</p>	<p>Car Parking and Public Transport Strategies - These strategies are currently in development, with a view to complete during 2011/12. LTP3 has been changed to reflect this.</p> <p>What will be achieved and how - The Local Area Transport Plans will set out the schemes to be delivered at a local level. We believed that a locally-based approach to delivering our strategies will deliver better outcomes for the local community, and the Local Area Transport Plan for the Harlington area will be developed during 2011/12 as part of the 'South Bedfordshire Rural Area Local Area Transport Plan'. The LATPs will also set out how each of these schemes will be delivered, and the funding for these schemes.</p> <p>Maps in the document being unclear - Noted, and where possible changes have been made.</p> <p>Kiss and Ride reference (P76) - Kiss and Ride refers to the provision of drop-off points at key transport interchanges, such as railway stations. As such we consider it relevant to this section of LTP3.</p> <p>Flitwick - Westoning Bypass - All information on the bypass that is relevant to the LTP3 Strategy has been included in LTP3. This is a long term project which the Council hopes to pursue over the lifetime of LTP3.</p> <p>Capacity - LTP3 has been developed taking account of the availability of funding from a variety of sources, most notably government and developer contributions. The levels of these funding sources are set out in the 4 Local Area Transport Plans that have been developed as part of LTP3.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>integrated transport plan should be integrated with all concerned and certainly any affects on Junction 12 and the railway will have knock on effects on Harlington's own access issues to either work, health provision, shops, leisure etc. Increases in traffic or rail freight will also have noise impact.</p> <p>With the recent financial constraints there could be a lot of development with a lack of infrastructure to actually support it. Relying on development to fund roads is inappropriate, as the suitability of the development could potentially be looked at in a secondary fashion – prioritising the roads which cannot be funded any other way.</p> <p>In general, a healthier life style by more walking and cycling etc is not going to be helped if the proposed CBC cuts to various budgets materialise. Removal of the Crossing Patrol, for example, could easily result in children being taken to school in cars for their safety and this undermines the efforts of the Travel To School initiatives. Reducing public transport and removing mobile libraries will create problems for many people that could result in more use of cars in some cases and no use of a public library for others.</p>	<p>Access to Healthcare - Access to healthcare facilities such as hospitals is a major priority of LTP3, as set out in the Journey Purpose Strategy.</p> <p>Out-commuting and Luton Northern Station - The transport impacts of Luton Northern Station will be assessed as part of the plans for future development to the north of Luton. The text in LTP3 reflects the current situation with regards to this station, and it's potential impacts on other stations. Central Bedfordshire Council will work with developers on this long-term scheme with a view of minimising it's impacts upon local communities.</p> <p>Harlington on the Designated Road Freight Route - Noted.</p> <p>M1 Junction 11A - Works on Junction 11A are closely linked to ongoing works on the A5-M1 Link. Central Bedfordshire Council is working with developers and the Highways Agency on developing this scheme.</p> <p>Ampthill and Flitwick as Minor Service Centres - Minor Service Centres are areas, typically located on the Secondary Freight Network, are towns as defined in the Core Strategy which contain a number of shops which are not in the Major Service Areas. Thus, some freight movements are required for local deliveries.</p> <p>Sundon Rail Freight Terminal - Changes have been made to the Freight Strategy to reflect the current position on the Sundon Rail Freight Terminal as outlined in the Core Strategy for Southern Bedfordshire. LTP3 supports facilities that will transfer freight from road to rail in principle, but this is subject to a number of planning</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		<p>considerations. LTP3 commits Central Bedfordshire Council to working with developers at an early stage to ensure that the impacts of such facilities on local communities are minimised, including transport impacts and managing road freight movements onto strategic roads.</p> <p>Developer funding of new infrastructure - As part of the planning process, it is reasonable to expect that developers provide contributions to offset the impacts of their developments, and to plan the necessary infrastructure as part of their development proposals. As part of LTP3, Central Bedfordshire Council will work pro-actively with developers in the identify and mitigate the transport impacts of major developments, and deliver the required infrastructure. We have assisted this approach by focussing the first 4 Local Area Transport Plans in the key growth areas of the authority, with the aim of developing the local sustainable transport networks in these areas in advance of growth taking place.</p> <p>Concerns over reduced funding - In the development of LTP3 we have taken full account of levels of funding available from a variety of sources. As a result, we consider that LTP3 is both an ambitious and realistic document. On many transport services we are looking to work more effectively with local partners to deliver services that provide a better value for money. You may also be aware that at a recent meeting of the Council's Executive the decision was taken to keep the School Crossing Patrols, while working with the community to ensure their long term viability.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
		I trust that the above response helps to clarify some matters. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact us.
Willis Dawson 11/02/11	Matters associated with Land to the East of Leighton Buzzard (<i>PDF file link to be provided</i>)	<p>Thank you very much for your recent comments on the Central Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan 3. After considering your comments, as well as those of others, please consider the below as our response to the matters that you have raised.</p> <p>Integration between new development and the local highway network LTP3 contains very strong links with both of the Local Development Frameworks covering the Central Bedfordshire area, and the authority is committed to working with developers, through the LTP and LDF processes, to successfully integrate new developments into existing communities. In LTP3 we have taken this approach most notably through the development of Local Area Transport Plans in the 4 key growth areas of the authority, where we are seeking to develop the local infrastructure to be able to cater for increased growth in these areas. It should also be noted that many of the land use planning maps have been removed at the request of our planners, and replaced with more up-to-date maps contained within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>East of Leighton-Linslade and the Leighton-Linslade Local Area Transport Plan As we have been preparing the Local Area Transport Plans for each area, we have taken account of current planned developments, and future growth planned for the town. This has now been included in the Local Area Transport Plans as a 'Baseline Report', showing how we have taken account of this growth. You may also wish to note that, following a number of comments, we have amended the Local Area Transport Plan to include reference to the Eastern Relief Road (although the majority of text on this scheme is still</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		<p>included in the main LTP3 Strategy as a major scheme). With regards to the 20% modal shift away from car-based travel in new developments, it is our view that it is important to set out this overall objective in LTP3 to highlight the Council's commitment to reducing the impacts of new developments. This is built upon experience with other developments, most notably the Sustainable Travel Exemplar Site to the South of Leighton Buzzard. We shall work positively with developers with sites as they are brought forward to ensure that this is achieved.</p> <p>Importance of Local Enterprise Partnerships The Council recognises the importance of the South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership, and has amended LTP3 to state how we plan to work effectively with SEMLEP on transport-related matters. It should be noted that SEMLEP has yet to strategic view on transport in its area, thus it would not be correct for LTP3 to 'pre-empt' the views of SEMLEP on these matters. Once SEMLEP has developed its strategic view on transport, then this will be considered as part of any review of LTP3.</p> <p>Journeys to Work and reduction in commuting trips Chapter 7 of LTP3 applies the over-arching objectives of LTP3 to a number of different journey purposes, one of which is journeys to work. As such, the content of this particular chapter of LTP3 is more strategic in nature by setting out overall objectives. Whilst the Council is supportive of means of reducing journey to work trips, whether they be part of new development or otherwise, we consider this to be a means of achieving these objectives. As such, this text is more suited to Chapter 8 of LTP3 (Areas of Intervention), where under the intervention of Land Use Planning, mixed used development is specifically mentioned.</p> <p>Car Parking The Council is currently developing its</p>

Name	Issue	Response
		overall car parking strategy for the authority, in which issues such as the recent revisions to PPG13 and effects of displaced demand for car parking will be considered. Your comments on these matters will be considered as part of this work. We trust that the above response is suitable. If you have any further queries on any of the above matters, please feel free to contact us
Natural England 11/02/11	The LTP should include details of integration with the Rights of Way Improvement Plan, as a key implementation mechanism. The LTP is expected to have a strong emphasis on sustainable transport, in particular promotion and improvement of options for foot, cycle, and public transport, in preference to private car use. We also advise you to look for opportunities to cross-reference to the Beds and Luton Green Infrastructure Strategy, and anticipate that the LTP will give added impetus to specific projects. Clearly the protection of designated sites of nature conservation and landscape importance is a high priority for us, as it the promotion of policies which seek to tackle and mitigate the effects of climate change.	Thank you for taking the time to review the LTP3 for Central Bedfordshire your comments are greatly received.,
First Group, 11/02/11	<p>I was enthused by our wide-ranging discussion at Bedford station this morning which included opportunities to improve rail and bus integration encompassing the promotion of PLUSBUS, the development of Station Travel Plans and the potential to develop Station Adoption at some FCC stations in Central Bedfordshire.</p> <p>As promised, here are my comments on the January 2011 Draft LTP3. You advised me this morning that, following earlier feedback, some of these have already been incorporated into the revised Draft.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add details of the increase in capacity of up to 50% that will result from the Thameslink Programme, which will benefit all FCC stations in Central Bedfordshire. 	<p>Tele-con response & meeting:</p> <p>A number of changes have been made to reflect the requirements, where it has not been possible this was discussed.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Add reference to the economic benefits of improved train services between Central Bedfordshire, London and destinations / origins south of the Thames. 3. Add details of planned platform extensions from eight to 12-carriage length at Arlesey, Biggleswade and Sandy stations. Funding for this has been brought forward from the Thameslink Programme. The platform extensions at all three of these stations will be completed in Summer 2012 and the first 12-car trains (running between Peterborough and King's Cross) will serve these stations from the December 2012 timetable change. 4. Add reference to PLUSBUS, which is available at all five FCC stations in Central Bedfordshire. As discussed, there is a massive opportunity to promote integrated bus / rail journeys to commuters by enhancing bus connections with peak morning and evening train services. 5. Add desire to improve bus interchanges at key stations including Flitwick, Biggleswade and Sandy. 6. Add detail on aspiration for Town Centre redevelopment at Flitwick station. 7. Add reference to planned Wixams station with step-free access to all platforms, bus interchange and high quality car parking. 8. Add aspiration to encourage more people to cycle to and from stations, including the provision of high quality cycle parking. 9. Central Bedfordshire's aspiration for Luton North station does not seem to be supported by the railway industry. There are no plans to close either Leagrave or Harlington stations. In fact, there is currently a massive investment in the installation of 	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>ticket gates at Leagrave, to be completed by April this year. The platforms at both Harlington and Leagrave stations are being extended in preparation for the introduction of the first 12 car trains between Bedford and Brighton from December 2011. In contrast Cricklewood station in North-West London is not having its platforms extended as the London Borough of Barnet has approved plans for a major Brent Cross-Cricklewood redevelopment which is likely to include a new station.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	
CCNB, 11/02/11	<p>Cycling Campaign for North Bedfordshire (CCNB) has examined the draft LTP3 and Appendices and must congratulate the team responsible for putting together the documents. We are in agreement with the LTP objectives and particularly like the six themes of the Journey Purpose Strategy and the Areas of Intervention.</p> <p>In Appendix F - Cycle Strategy – we are strongly supportive of the Infrastructure Toolkit under Appendix B.</p> <p>All that is needed now is a sufficient budget and funds to enable actions to take place on the ground from the start of the financial year on 1 April 2011.</p>	Thank you for your response, local input is very important to the development of the LTP and your views are greatly appreciated.
Pegasus Planning 11/02/11	<p>I am writing on behalf of our clients Taylor Wimpey and Martin Grant Homes in respect of the Draft Local Transport Plan 3 for Central Bedfordshire which states that its vision is to <i>“Improve the quality of life of all in Central Bedfordshire, and enhance the unique character of our communities and environment by creating an integrated transport system that is safe, sustainable and accessible for all.”</i></p> <p>We urge Central Bedfordshire to amend the document as it is currently formulated, to provide a clear and coherent evidence base as to where the monies for these improvement works will come from. Throughout Appendix K, in particular pages 38 - 41, reference is made to Land East</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in response to the publication of the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire. There are a number of points to be made in response to the issues you highlighted in your letter, specifically focusing upon the source of funding for the transport improvements identified.</p> <p>The Local Transport Plan (LTP) and the supporting Local Area Transport Plan (LATP), which should be read in conjunction with one another, make it quite clear as to the sources of funding through which the objectives of the</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>of Biggleswade being the source of funding for works to be undertaken within the Biggleswade and Sandy LATP however there is no mention of where other sources of funding are coming from; the document as it currently stands solely depends upon the contributions from this one development which will take many years, if the 100 units per annum is the actual build rate, to come to fruition. Whilst it is accepted that the developer is committed to these provisions, it would be beneficial to know if other sources of funding are available and are being sought by Central Bedfordshire. In addition, the S106 monies secured in connection with this development are targeted towards specific projects and are not available for reallocation to the 'wish list' detailed in the Transport Plan. The document does not identify where monies will actually come from. This is important with cutbacks in Council spending further reducing the potential for improvement projects to come forward especially when there are other services etc which serve a wider section of the community.</p> <p>It should also be noted that this document does not accord with the adopted Planning Obligations SPD and how they seek contributions from developers. It also fails to comply with the principles contained in Circular 05/2005 and CIL Regulation 122 (which came into force on 6th April 2010) which states that <i>"A planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting permission for the development if the obligation is:</i></p> <p><i>a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;</i></p> <p><i>b) directly related to the development; and</i></p> <p><i>c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development."</i></p> <p>In accordance with CIL Regulation 122, the strategy is too generalised and seeks contributions and facilities outside both the scope and spirit of the CIL regulations. It should be highlighted that it is not a developers responsibility under CIL Regulation 122 to address existing deficits with these regulations clearly stating that facilities should be directly related to a development. Nor is it considered acceptable that any facility which would be provided on the development site, for the developer to have to contribute payments towards the maintenance of the facility as this is</p>	<p>Plan will be delivered. Chapter 10 of the LTP highlights the level of integrated transport funding the authority is set to receive, which will be invested in transport improvements, and how this is to be allocation to each LATP area. Further information is also contained on additional sources of funding which the authority will seek to secure to develop a safe and sustainable transport system across the whole of Central Bedfordshire. Therefore your comment that the LTP does not provide "a clear and coherent evidence base as to where improvements will come from" is completely unfounded.</p> <p>At the local level, the LATPs set out the areas within which the integrated transport budget will be invested. Detail of these schemes has subsequently been included within the LATP through the development of the programme at the same time as the consultation period on the draft LTP.</p> <p>Other schemes to be funded through developer contributions are also listed. The commitment for these to be funded by developers has been established through the planning process and planning contributions to be received by the authority associated with development in Biggleswade. These schemes are listed alongside those to be funded directly through the LTP to emphasis the integrated approach of the authority in the delivery of these schemes.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should also be highlighted that the LTP does not contain a wish list. It sets out a strategic approach to investment in transport improvements which are required to facilitate growth and encourage more sustainable travel.</p> <p>Thank you again for taking the opportunity to comment on the LTP.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>something that the developer would organise through their own management company.</p> <p>It is therefore believed that the overall aim of the document is not considered to be reasonable as there is no full explanation as to how the money will be obtained. Therefore we believe that this document should be withdrawn.</p>	
SUSTRANS, 11/02/22	<p>Further to our more formal response to your Draft Cycling Strategy where Sustrans Aims, Core Policy and Call to Action were presented together with our detailed comments; these brief comments now refer to your LTP3, revised Cycling Strategy and emerging Local Area Transport Plans.</p> <p>It is pleasing to see that you place emphasis on a transport system that is safe, sustainable and accessible for all; with modal shift to walking and cycling through Smarter Choices initiatives featuring strongly. A strategy that focuses on Journey Purpose is also to be commended.</p> <p>However, it is disappointing that you have not included Sustrans as a partner or key stakeholder - but should you wish to reconsider this then perhaps we could be "Working together to achieve significant modal shift from unnecessary car use to sustainable travel".</p> <p>As with your original Draft Cycling Strategy, it is also disappointing that you appear to have not included any targets at this stage, so we would take this opportunity to reiterate our previous recommendation as defined in our 'Call to Action' that a completely different approach to cycling is adopted in order to achieve major change from the national average cycling level of 2% to 20% by 2010. The various documents give a general implication that major change is the objective, it would therefore be appropriate if this were reflected in the targets.</p> <p>Would it help if I were to do a map of the NCN in Central Bedfordshire including the 3 planned routes?</p> <p>You have obviously given considerable thought to the Cycle Network Hierarchy, and that presented in the current Draft Cycling Strategy takes</p>	<p>Thank you for your positive comments we very much look forward to working with you in the future we have also noted your interest in the shared space schemes and would be interested to keep you informed of these and your expertise would be greatly welcome in this area.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>account of many points made in our earlier submission. However the reference to "The National Cycle Network (NCN) providing a safe cycling environment for children over 12 years of age" ... is totally inadequate, the wording should also include: - walkers, families with young children, novice adult cyclists and experienced commuter cyclists who prefer the safer environment offered by the NCN standard of cycle provision whether traffic-free or on-road.</p> <p>It is apparent that the introduction of Shared Space initiatives feature in several of the Local Area Transport Plans, and this is to be commended where the intention is to improve the quality of life of local residents and pedestrian / cycle users of the space, however it should be noted that these measures do not offer a panacea for solving problems of congestion when traffic volumes will remain at similarly high levels and there is no alternative route for the 'unwelcome' traffic.</p> <p>In conclusion, we welcome Central Bedfordshire's commitment to a strategy that recognises the urgent need for modal shift towards walking, cycling and greater use of public transport and look forward to future opportunities to contribute to the delivery of these strategies and plans.</p>	
<p>CTC right to ride representative 11/02/11</p>	<p>In general I fully support the principles and aspirations, as detailed in both the LTP Plan 3 Draft and the supporting Appendix F, covering Cycling Strategy. However, if the aims of the cycling strategies are going to be achieved, based on the experiences of similar adopted aspirations by previous administrations, there needs to be a far greater commitment to implementation.</p> <p>In 2001 the Mid Bedfordshire District Council adopted a Cycle Mapping Project, which detailed a network of safe cycling routes between and within townships in its domain. Ten years later, very few of the schemes have been implemented, especially within my local Ampthill and Flitwick area. Many of the schemes were quite modest, often involving only the erection of signage, rather than major physical work.</p> <p>One problem facing MBDC was the fact that although it was the planning authority, it did not control the financial strings, which were a Bedfordshire County Council responsibility. The transition to unitary local</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in response to the Draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire. We appreciate your general support of the Plan and will seek to continue working with the CTC in the implementation of schemes on the ground. With regard to specific points that you raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LTP forms the authority's commitment to improving conditions for cycling over the Plan period. The vision of the Plan refers to the development of a safe and sustainable transport system, whilst a number of the objectives relate to the need to improve access via sustainable

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>government now places adopted aspirations and financing under a single authority.</p> <p>Although at the working level, there is a solid dedication to improve the cycling environment, I remain to be convinced that at higher level, both with senior council officers and elected councillors, there is the same level of commitment to achieve adopted policies.</p> <p>A key section within the LTP Plan 3 document relates to the Preference Hierarchy, summarised on Page 35. Cycling is designated as the top priority travel mode for journeys of 2-5 miles. Walking is the top priority travel mode for journeys of 0-2 miles. Possibly the threshold distance between walking and cycling should be closer to one mile. Most journeys involve out-and-back travel. Walking four miles in a day is quite challenging and time-consuming.</p> <p>The quest to persuade motorists into their cars for short journeys is highly commendable. Unfortunately the current perception by many residents is that cycling is a perilous mode of travel. Superficially, most people believe that "the roads are dangerous for cyclists".</p> <p>The danger perception is partly myth, partly reality. Certainly cyclists do have to face specific challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some infrastructure creates a poor cycling environment, particularly roundabouts and pinch-points, such as traffic islands. A few years ago, a cycle infrastructure specialist gave a presentation to the BEDS CC Cycle Forum. None of the multitude of cycle-friendly layouts featured a roundabout. • A small minority of drivers behave with a disregard for the safety of cyclists. The main misdemeanours are overtaking too closely, sometimes within touching distance, and overtaking and immediately turning left. With such a high level of traffic in most townships, the chance of an occasional frightening encounter is almost inevitable. These incidents definitely deter inexperienced cyclists from using cycling as their travel mode for short distances. • The low level of road traffic law enforcement means that bad behaviour towards cyclists by drivers is unlikely to be detected, especially away from main routes. More extensive enforcement 	<p>modes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to the preference hierarchy has been removed from the LTP. It is felt that there is sufficient emphasis on promoting walking and cycling throughout the document, whilst both the pedestrian and cycle network hierarchies established as a concept within the respective appendices, and the precise routes of which have been detailed within the Local Area Transport Plans form a clear steer as to investment priorities. • The enforcement of traffic speeds is the responsibility of the Police. The authority will seek to work closely with the Police through the delivery of the Road Safety Strategy which forms another of the appendices of the Plan, addressing each of the three "e's" associated with reducing the number of people killed or seriously injured – engineering measures, enforcement and education. • The approach of the Plan is such that it seeks to create an environment where cyclists and motorists should be able to co-exist. This may be through the provision of 'shared space' in some locations, the reallocation of road space in others and general road space and speed management measures where appropriate. <p>We hope that these comments help clarify the position of the authority on the cycle related matters you have raised, and once again thank you for taking the time out to comment on the document.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>of the traffic laws is desirable, but probably the police resource is insufficient to make a major impact. In an age of budget cuts, speed cameras in 30 mph areas must be retained. Rural roads and lanes are becoming a danger area for cyclists, since law enforcement is virtually non-existent and vehicle speeds can be high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A growing hazard for cyclists is the use of mobile phones by drivers, despite the stricter laws imposed in the last few years. Too many drivers know that the chance of being caught is low. From experience, the close-passing driver often appears to be using a mobile phone. Again, an increasing vulnerability for cyclists from this law infringement is along rural roads and lanes. • Other than the main routes through townships, all roads within residential areas should be restricted to 20 mph. • For reasons beyond my understanding, signage of cycle routes, whether on the normal carriageway or off-road is often overlooked. Signage not only encourages cyclists, but also makes drivers aware of the presence of cyclists. <p>In general, cyclists and motorists should be able to co-exist on the same carriageway, especially in 30 mph areas. Where land-space permits, dedicated off-road cycle paths are desirable. On-road cycle lanes are a dilemma. Often they are provided along safer stretches, and then vanish at the danger points. Also, illegal car parking on cycle lanes can create problems.</p> <p>The Cycling Strategy Appendix makes reference to the updated Cycle Mapping Project. This admirable document details a network of designated cycle routes within and between townships. Attached is my response, dated 28th October 2009, the contents of which are relevant to many topics raised in the Draft Local Transport Plan 3 and its associated cycling appendix.</p> <p>To summarise, I support the principles and aspirations detailed within the draft plan and the cycling appendix, subject to a firm commitment by councillors and council officers to implement the required action.</p>	

Name	Issue	Response
Luton Borough Council, 11/02/11	<p>I refer to the consultation on the aforementioned plan, details of which you sent to us on 4 January. Our comments are based on the main LTP3 document, although through our involvement in the Joint Local Access Forum Council officers have also been a party to consideration of the walking and cycling strategies that accompany the LTP.</p> <p>Overall, the strategy is comprehensive and covers a similar range of strategy interventions to the Luton LTP. Most of the strategy principles set out in the accompanying walking and cycling strategies are also consistent with those set out in the Borough Council's LTP3. We have two observations to make about this part of the main document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst Page 76 of the document refers to proposed Park & Ride sites around the Luton Dunstable and Houghton Regis conurbation, I am surprised that no specific reference is made to the location of those sites given that these are specifically identified in the Luton and southern Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy. Given that the Core Strategy includes an allocation for a rail freight interchange adjacent to the old Sundon Quarry, I am surprised there is no reference to the sustainable freight distribution opportunities that development of that site could provide in particular for a freight consolidation centre to serve the conurbation. <p>Our main comments relate to the Implementation Plan section of the document, Chapters 9 and 10, which respectively contain details of major transport projects as well as a range of other more local interventions.</p> <p>In relation to the chapter about strategic transport schemes we have three comments:</p> <p>i) The map on Page 81 of the LTP3 contains a range of route options for</p>	<p>1. Whilst Page 76 of the document refers to proposed Park & Ride sites around the Luton Dunstable and Houghton Regis conurbation, I am surprised that no specific reference is made to the location of those sites given that these are specifically identified in the Luton and southern Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy.</p> <p>- noted, we will add extra text to incorporate more detailed information</p> <p>2. Given that the Core Strategy includes an allocation for a rail freight interchange adjacent to the old Sundon Quarry, I am surprised there is no reference to the sustainable freight distribution opportunities that development of that site could provide in particular for a freight consolidation centre to serve the conurbation</p> <p>- The Rail Freight Interchange has been discussed as part of other comments received. The view is that the RFI is something that is specifically dealt with as part of the Freight Strategy, which forms part of LTP3. We have made substantial changes to the Freight Strategy in consultation with Andrew Wintersgill (Prologis?), and we agreed a position whereby the RFI should be mentioned specifically in the Freight Strategy, and the current wording of LTP3 is very much supportive of RFIs and need not be changed. As these changes have been agreed with the organisation promoting the RFI, we feel no changes should be made.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Luton Northern Bypass. This does not reflect the fact that, following the public consultation on route options held in January/February 2009, the Joint Committee at its meeting on 23 March agreed to adopt a preferred outer route. To address this it would be helpful if the following was used as the first paragraph in the section about Luton Northern Bypass:</p> <p>“Public consultation on alternative routes for Luton Northern Bypass was presented at a public and stakeholder consultation in early 2009. The results of that consultation were reported to the Joint Committee that March, and the Committee resolved to support proposals for an outer bypass subject to the outcome of further more detailed work.”</p> <p>ii) In addition there needs to be more consistency between the Luton and Central Bedfordshire LTPs about the specific paragraphs on the Northern Bypass. Whilst both LTPs indicate that the M1-A6 section of the Northern Bypass will come forward in conjunction with the planned Strategic Site Specific Allocation north of Luton, with regard to the eastern section, the Luton LTP3 states that “Luton and Central Bedfordshire will continue to progress the A6-A505 section in timescales consistent with that development”, whereas your LTP states that “it is unlikely that the A6-A505 section of the bypass will be progressed during the time period covered by this LTP.” In terms of addressing these inconsistencies, I suggest rewording the final paragraph of the section in your LTP3 as follows:</p> <p>“East of the A6, proposals are for a link through to the A505 Hitchin Road. Whilst the preference of the Joint Committee was for an outer route, work is currently ongoing to develop a design that addresses the environmental sensitivity of any routes in this area. Luton and Central Bedfordshire Councils will continue to progress proposals for the A6-A505 section in timescales consistent with the provision of the</p>	<p>3. The map on Page 81 of the LTP3 contains a range of route options for Luton Northern Bypass. This does not reflect the fact that, following the public consultation on route options held in January/February 2009, the Joint Committee at its meeting on 23 March agreed to adopt a preferred outer route. To address this it would be helpful if the following was used as the first paragraph in the section about Luton Northern Bypass:</p> <p>“Public consultation on alternative routes for Luton Northern Bypass was presented at a public and stakeholder consultation in early 2009. The results of that consultation were reported to the Joint Committee that March, and the Committee resolved to support proposals for an outer bypass subject to the outcome of further more detailed work.”</p> <p>And</p> <p>In addition there needs to be more consistency between the Luton and Central Bedfordshire LTPs about the specific paragraphs on the Northern Bypass. Whilst both LTPs indicate that the M1-A6 section of the Northern Bypass will come forward in conjunction with the planned Strategic Site Specific Allocation north of Luton, with regard to the eastern section, the Luton LTP3 states that “Luton and Central Bedfordshire will continue to progress the A6-A505 section in timescales consistent with that development”, whereas your LTP states that “it is unlikely that the A6-A505 section of the bypass will be progressed during</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>M1 to A6 section of the bypass as part of the North Luton SSSA.”</p> <p>iii) The Central Bedfordshire LTP3 is very specific about the aspirations for a Luton Northern station to serve the northern urban extension of the Luton Dunstable and Houghton Regis conurbation, whereas the Luton LTP3 is less specific, stating that</p> <p>“The proposed M1 Junction 11a and related highway infrastructure will provide an opportunity for public transport improvements in the vicinity of that junction, in particular given the close proximity of the planned development both to that junction and the Midland Main Line. Luton Borough and Central Bedfordshire Councils are working in partnership with the Developers, the Highways Agency, and Network Rail to examine the potential for either a bus or rail based Park & Ride site (or a combination of the two) in the vicinity of that junction.”</p> <p>My preference would be to use these words, although I would be happy to incorporate the last sentence of this section of your LTP3 which refers to the possibility of having to close either Harlington or Leagrave stations.</p> <p>iv) It would be helpful if the section about the M1 Junction 10a improvements could include a final sentence referring to the recent Regional Growth Fund application for a £13m contribution to implement the improvements at this junction, which we expect to be notified the outcome of in mid –late April.</p> <p>Turning to Chapter 10, which is about the smaller scale schemes and initiatives, we are very disappointed in the content of that chapter in particular given the extensive discussions at previous joint meetings about specific schemes in Dunstable and Houghton Regis, such as the</p>	<p>the time period covered by this LTP.” In terms of addressing these inconsistencies, I suggest rewording the final paragraph of the section in your LTP3 as follows:</p> <p>“East of the A6, proposals are for a link through to the A505 Hitchin Road. Whilst the preference of the Joint Committee was for an outer route, work is currently ongoing to develop a design that addresses the environmental sensitivity of any routes in this area. Luton and Central Bedfordshire Councils will continue to progress proposals for the A6-A505 section in timescales consistent with the provision of the M1 to A6 section of the bypass as part of the North Luton SSSA.”</p> <p>- In response to your comments and upon consideration we have altered the section as follows:</p> <p><i>Luton Northern Bypass</i></p> <p><i>Between the M1 and A6 and North of Luton lies the North Luton Strategic Site Specific Allocation which is identified in the Core Strategy as having the capacity for approximately 1,800 private and affordable homes. The Masterplan for the area has not yet been developed and it will provide greater guidance about the scale and location of the infrastructure requirements but one of the key</i></p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>implementation of an HGV ban on Poynters Road and development of workplace travel plan initiatives in the employment areas to the east of Dunstable particularly in the context of the significant opportunities that the Luton Dunstable Busway and the adjacent pedestrian/cycle route would provide in terms of more sustainable travel to work.</p> <p>I trust the above information, together with the accompanying copy of the main document which highlights a number of typos, missing/duplicated words, and more minor changes is helpful. In particular I would appreciate the aforementioned changes being made to the document as set out on the previous page of this response. In the meantime please contact me should you wish to further discuss any of these matters.</p>	<p><i>transport links in the area will be the Luton Northern Bypass (M1 to A6) which will link into Junction 11A of the M1 and thus into the A5-M1 link (Dunstable Northern Bypass).</i></p> <p><i>The scheme between the M1 and A6 is wholly within Central Bedfordshire and we shall be fully involved in the development of the Masterplan for the area. This scheme will be constructed as part of the planned development north of Luton.</i></p> <p><i>In March 2009 the results of public and stakeholder consultation were presented to the Joint committee. As a result the committee resolved to support an outer bypass subject to the outcome of further more detailed work.</i></p> <p><i>East of the A6 proposals for a link through to the A505 are for the longer term. Luton and Central Bedfordshire Councils will continue to progress it in timescales consistent with planned development for the area.</i></p> <p>4. The Central Bedfordshire LTP3 is very specific about the aspirations for a Luton Northern station to serve the northern urban extension of the Luton Dunstable and Houghton Regis conurbation, whereas the Luton LTP3 is less specific, stating that</p> <p>"The proposed M1 Junction 11a and related highway infrastructure will provide an opportunity</p>

Name	Issue	Response
		<p>for public transport improvements in the vicinity of that junction, in particular given the close proximity of the planned development both to that junction and the Midland Main Line. Luton Borough and Central Bedfordshire Councils are working in partnership with the Developers, the Highways Agency, and Network Rail to examine the potential for either a bus or rail based Park & Ride site (or a combination of the two) in the vicinity of that junction.”</p> <p>My preference would be to use these words, although I would be happy to incorporate the last sentence of this section of your LTP3 which refers to the possibility of having to close either Harlington or Leagrave stations.</p> <p>- The wording within our LTP relates specifically to the core strategy and we would prefer to remain consistent with this.</p> <p>5. It would be helpful if the section about the M1 Junction 10a improvements could include a final sentence referring to the recent Regional Growth Fund application for a £13m contribution to implement the improvements at this junction, which we expect to be notified the outcome of in mid –late April.</p> <p>- Noted, a sentence has been added to reflect this.</p> <p>6. Turning to Chapter 10, which is about the smaller scale schemes and initiatives, we are very</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		<p>disappointed in the content of that chapter in particular given the extensive discussions at previous joint meetings about specific schemes in Dunstable and Houghton Regis, such as the implementation of an HGV ban on Poynters Road and development of workplace travel plan initiatives in the employment areas to the east of Dunstable particularly in the context of the significant opportunities that the Luton Dunstable Busway and the adjacent pedestrian/cycle route would provide in terms of more sustainable travel to work.</p> <p>- I was surprised to see this comment in your letter given that at our meeting on the 17 January, when you raised this concern, I explained that the Local Area Transport Plans (LATP) and specifically the LATP for Dunstable & Houghton Regis provides the full programme, including the Poynters Road HGV lorry ban and is included as an appendix.</p> <p>However, the LTP does specify how we have structured the document and this can be found on page 17 and as such demonstrates that the LATP's detail the Implementation plans. Furthermore pages 89 – 95 offer further detail in relation to the LATP's and specifically on page 95 the opening paragraph states:</p> <p><i>“The individual Local Area Transport Plans contain the ‘long list’ of schemes to be delivered</i></p>

Name	Issue	Response
		<p><i>locally".</i></p> <p>Page 95 offers a summary of schemes and Appendix L: Dunstable and Houghton Regis LATP which details more information was available to view on the Internet or upon request.</p>
Resident, Pulloxhill and Bedfordshire Council's Planning Consortium 11/02/11	<p>3) <u>THE CONSULTATION PROCESS</u></p> <p>Most of our members have expressed grave concerns at not only the document consultation process but also the wider consultation process as whole. The end result we feel is a flawed, non-robust, inconsiderate (to consultees) process which is not inclusive. Our justifications for these criticisms are as follows</p> <p>e) Parish Councils (via their Clerks) and other consultees were not written to in advance of the commencement of the wider consultation exercise, explaining what the LTP3 consultation exercise was all about, time scales, how consultees were to collaborate and be involved, what feedback the Transport Strategy team was requesting of its consultees etc etc in the compilation of data to underpin the new transport policy document. This is surely recognised as the first step in the wider communication process, why was it omitted in this case?</p> <p>Our Parish Council members in particular felt that Central Bedfordshire Council has paid lip service to involving them in the wider consultation process, never having been directly approached until 12th January 2011, when they were made aware of over 1,000 pages of documents, comprising the Draft Plan and Appendices on which the authority was demanding a response in less than one month. One member observed that as far as he was aware, apart from</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Thank you very much for your submission to the recent consultation on the Draft Central Bedfordshire Council Local Transport Plan 3. Please find below our response to your submission.</p> <p><u>Overall comments</u></p> <p>We appreciate your concerns regarding the deliverability of the aims and some projects as part of LTP3. Throughout the development of LTP3 consideration has been given to funding levels, and LTP3 has been developed on the assumption of a significant reduction in funding for delivery. We are therefore confident that the plans and programmes to be delivered as part of LTP3 are realistic and achievable.</p> <p><u>The Consultation Process</u></p> <p>You will be aware of the previous correspondence that there has been with yourselves concerning this issue. Whilst we understand that the timescales for comments on</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>the single stakeholder workshop, the other consultation undertaken has focused on social media facilities such as a blog and web page on www.letstalkcentral.com and a series of market stalls at locations such as Biggleswade and Leighton Buzzard over the summer. There are obvious concerns over this format, LTP3 involves complex issues that are difficult to convey to members of the public in just a few minutes on a market stall and a large proportion of regular public transport users do not have internet access.</p> <p>f) Certain consultees were notified of the commencement of the consultation on the Draft LTP3 document on 6th January, despite promises that the consultation would commence in mid December and then 22nd January. Inexplicably, Parish Councils were not notified until 12th January! Clearly a mistake occurred and, in spite of the question as to why the delay/what went wrong, nobody has received an admission that CBC made a mistake and an apology!</p> <p>g) Karen Aspinall, CBC's Consultation Manager is well aware that</p> <p>ii) Many Parish Councils have their meetings every 2 months and she agrees therefore that a document consultation period should reflect this situation in order that it may be described as all inclusive and robust and this is 'officially' recognised by CBC. Providing a mere month to Parish Councils and other consultees to provide feedback on this massive (over 1,000 pages), vitally important and long lasting (15years) policy document is not only inconsiderate but unacceptable. It will clearly minimise the volume of feedback comments the authority receives, which it claims are so important a part of the consultation process.</p> <p>iii) CBC is a signatory to the Bedfordshire and Luton Compact which states that the authority will undertake to "conduct 12 week</p>	<p>the main LTP3 Strategy were shorter than desired, there has been extensive consultation on LTP3 in its development. Directly relevant to Parish Councils is our attendance at the June 2010 Town and Parish Council conference, and being invited to provide feedback on LTP3 via Let's Talk Central as well as more traditional means such as email or letter. In the future, we will be developing a Local Area Transport Plan for other areas in Central Bedfordshire, and common to the approach that we have taken in developing the existing Local Area Transport Plans we shall be working closely with local Town and Parish Councils in developing the plans. We look forward to working with the relevant Town and Parish Councils in each of their areas.</p> <p><u>Anticipated Levels of Growth</u></p> <p>The levels of growth anticipated in the Local Transport Plan are based upon current and emerging figures for levels of housing and employment developments as set out in the Local Development Framework for the Northern Area, and emerging Core Strategy for the Southern Bedfordshire and Luton Area. This has been done so as to maintain consistency between LTP3 and local planning documents. Should levels of growth change, then LTP3 will be reviewed in light of these changes.</p> <p><u>Rural Community Issues</u></p> <p>The main LTP3 Strategy Document identifies the main strategic issues facing transport in Central Bedfordshire, and sets out the main approaches that will be taken to tackling these strategic issues. We do, however,</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>formal written consultations, with an explanation given for shorter time frames,” to third sector organisations (defined as voluntary bodies). KA has confirmed that a ‘formal written consultation’ obviously refers to a document, not the wider process as the Transport Strategy team has repeatedly claimed and the document was presumably circulated to various voluntary bodies representing walkers, cyclists, horse riders etc. As these voluntary organisations were not provided with the agreed 12 week consultation period and no explanation offered for the unreasonably short consultation period, we have another example of the Transport Strategy team ignoring best practice.</p> <p>iv) She indicates that CBC’s guidance to staff re consultation processes includes recognition that not all potential consultees have access to/an inclination to use the internet. Therefore the availability of hard copies of relevant documents for consultation at an early stage is essential. In the myJourney Newsletter sent out initially on 6th January, which announced the draft document consultation, CBC promised “two reference copies of the LTP will be available (from libraries, CBC offices etc) from 7th January.” The reality was that one copy was sent out to libraries on 12th January, not arriving at Flitwick library until 17th January. When a member of the public enquired of the librarian at Flitwick library about a hard copy of an Appendix, the message the librarian received from CBC, that she had to pass on the interested party, was that “the document is on the internet.” Not for the first time, we see a consultation process where CBC officers incorrectly assume that all consultees are conversant with and have access to the internet.</p> <p>h) We deplore that fact that the consultation on this document appears to have focussed on stakeholders and agencies and a few targetted councils in growth areas. This is an authority wide strategy and therefore consultation should have been authority wide. An officer</p>	<p>appreciate that different areas in Central Bedfordshire will face different local issues, whether they be rural areas or urban areas. It is therefore the role of Local Area Transport Plans to identify these local issues, and appropriate schemes and interventions that will help to tackle these issues.</p> <p><u>Quiet Lanes</u></p> <p>Again, there has been much in the way of correspondence with yourselves concerning this issue. To clarify our position on this matter, whilst Quiet Lanes have not been identified as a matter of strategic importance in the LTP3 Strategy, they may be raised as local solutions as part of the Local Area Transport Plans. Should there be local support for Quiet Lanes schemes, they will be considered alongside other interventions to be included in the relevant Local Area Transport Plans.</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>We note your comments concerning connectivity, with there being no mention of rail issues. We have made changes to LTP3 which include a number of key strategic rail schemes (for example the Thameslink Programme), and expressing our support for such schemes. With regards to the specific section of LTP3 that you have mentioned, these interventions have been included as examples of local transport over which the authority has direct control, although we mention in this section about enhancing connectivity between local bus and rail service. We are committed to working with rail operators to improving local rail services for all residents.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>commented "The approach we took was to try and use audiences appropriately, not overburdening bodies with consultation where they can more usefully be consulted at another time" we found this patronising in the extreme and is in effect denying local communities, outside the targeted areas, any input into the final draft LTP3. This strategy is the overarching framework from which LATPs will be developed. It is clearly not <i>inclusive</i> to only include local communities in their own local area transport plans without encouraging and allowing the inclusive input of all Parish and Town Councils into the draft framework.</p> <p>Overall, a catalogue of major failures by CBC in terms of conducting a robust, all inclusive consultative process on the draft LTP3 document and the many Appendices. What our members are very concerned about is that, in spite of drawing these various issues to relevant CBC officers' attention, there has been a total failure of the Authority to accept it made mistakes, admit those mistakes and to make assurances that lessons will be learnt, thereby ensuring a better service to its customers in the future. This head in the sand approach is totally unacceptable and irresponsible in our view.</p> <p>As reported in the local press in January, Cllr Tom Nicols, Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development, referring to the Draft LTP3 document, stated "This is a very important document and it is essential that residents who will benefit and be affected by travel in Central Bedfordshire have the opportunity to voice their opinion." We are sure all would agree and fully support this sentiment, so why has CBC shown such <u>a lack of consideration</u> in the consultation period provided to the representatives of those residents and the residents themselves?</p>	<p>Regarding your comments concerning restrictions associated with the A5 – M1 Link, particularly in relation to freight on the A5120, local restrictions will be investigated as part of the process of delivering this specific scheme. This could include the A5120.</p> <p>We thank you for your suggestions on improving local bus services. You are aware that the Council has recently undertaken a review of local bus services, which has resulted in revised bus services operating from 28th March 2010. With regards to the specific bus service that you mention, you may be interested to know of the X31 bus service from Toddington to Houghton Regis, Dunstable, and Luton, which provides an hourly bus service along this route (although the frequency is lower in villages such as Tebworth).</p> <p>We thank you very much for your comments on the Draft LTP3 for Central Bedfordshire. If you would like to see a copy of the Final LTP3 document, this will be on our website from 1st April 2011. Please visit www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/myjourney for more information.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>4) <u>COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT LTP3 DOCUMENT</u></p> <p>The membership of our organisation recognises that a substantial amount of time and effort has gone into the compilation of the draft document and the appendices and much of the substance of the document is to be applauded and supported. However, we have had the concern expressed that all these grand objectives need funding and nowhere in the document is a warning note of realism sounded that in these very difficult economic times for Local Authorities, delivery of the aims stated may well be unachievable in several instances. In fact, in the case of rural bus service provision, we are likely to see a reduced service from April of this year.</p> <p><u>ANTICIPATED GROWTH</u></p> <p>It particularly concerns our membership in the Northern sector of Central Bedfordshire that housing and jobs growth is still based on the discredited top down approach of the RSS and that no account has been taken of the significant economic downturn this country has and is continuing to suffer, since the East of England Plan figures were published. Instead of a needs based, bottom up approach, as adopted for the Southern sector, the draft LTP3 is basing its traffic growth projections on overly optimistic figures for the Northern sector, which obviously skews the overall growth projections for Central Bedfordshire as a whole.</p> <p><u>RURAL COMMUNITY ISSUES</u></p> <p>Whatever the scale of growth over the 15 year period of the Plan, there will inevitably be a significant increase in the number of vehicles on our rural roads. We do not feel that there is recognition in the Plan of the inevitable increases in 'rat running' through our villages and along our country lanes and the inevitable road safety issues, particularly for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There is mention of ways of tackling such safety issues in urban areas but not in the countryside. We feel this should be recognised as an issue of considerable importance and there should therefore be</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>commensurate contingency planning detailed in the document that Parish Councils can request be implemented when necessary.</p> <p><u>QUIET LANES</u></p> <p>The dropping of any reference whatsoever to Quiet Lanes in this Draft LTP document, when its predecessor had a Policy Note on Quiet Lanes built into it, is, we feel, a retrograde step. To use the excuse that as Quiet Lanes were not mentioned in the wider consultation and that this therefore justified their omission is ridiculous. We have already identified the totally inadequate attempt to involve Parish Councils in the consultation prior to the draft document stage. CBC admits that they have a record of at least a dozen Parish Councils which have detailed a lane or lanes in their parish (and were contacted by CBC in February of 2010 to confirm indications of the cost areas in establishing a Quiet Lane) which they feel should be designated Quiet Lanes to protect and encourage <i>shared space</i> for vehicles, cyclists, walkers and horse riders. This concept of 'shared space' is mentioned on Page 66 of the Plan document, but only in an urban context. Surely it should be recognized that it can also apply in the rural environment as well and would it really cause problems to mention the term Quiet Lanes in the document? As Alice Crampin of CPRE Bedfordshire observed, the omission of any reference to Quiet Lanes in the LTP document "seems to sit ill with Green Infrastructure initiatives, and the push towards a greater recognition for quality of life issues and measures. With the growing use of lanes for 'rat-running' to avoid ever increasing congestion on main routes, the need for Quiet Lanes is getting greater."</p> <p>As so much effort has already been expended in establishing the concept of Quiet Lanes in our area, we trust we can rely on common sense to apply. If not, we request a clear commitment from CBC that the lack of specific mention of Quiet Lanes does not preclude their inclusion in the future, be it in LATPs or instigated by a Parish or Town Council.</p> <p><u>TRANSPORT</u></p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>There appears to be an oversight re Connectivity (P64-65) as there is no mention of rail services in this section.</p> <p>We would like to see the following addition inserted in the document Section 70 – Access Restriction. As soon as the A5 – M1 link road is completed, HGV access restrictions to be introduced on the A5120, bridleway and with the link road.</p> <p>We would suggest the extension of some bus service to make them more useful and therefore better patronized. For example, if the #42 that runs from Bedford to Toddington ran on to Houghton Regis, it would mean that all the villages that access it (and that's most along the A5120) could then get to the Central Beds Council centre in Houghton Regis which unlike village branch libraries is open all and every working day. HR also has good bus links with Luton and Dunstable. Irritatingly, it seems that service providers always want to strip services Beeching-like of their usefulness so e.g. one in three #42 buses bypass Harlington and go straight from Toddington to Westoning (and vice versa). Thus many of our older village residents who use the Toddington doctor's surgery only have a 2 in 3 chance of getting the bus there and back.</p> <p>We trust there will be some positive action taken regarding the comments our organisation has detailed concerning improvements to the draft document and that future consultation processes initiated by CBC show full consideration to its consultees regarding notification, consultation time re documents etc.</p>	
Resident, wrestlingworth 11/02/11	<p>I have read the above document and whilst I have several general comments later, there is one particular item of major concern</p> <p>5.6 Freight</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to respond to the publication of our draft LTP, local knowledge is very important to the process and we are grateful of your input. I should like to address the issues you raised as follows:</p> <p>Freight</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Besides the obvious route being the A.1. it shows a Secondary Freight Route for 'Access & deliveries'.</p> <p>This secondary freight route to the east of Biggleswade and Sandy comprises the B 1042 and B1040.</p> <p>i) These two, essentially minor, roads intersect at Potton, via Station Road/Biggleswade Road and Sun Street/ Royston Street.</p> <p>These sections of roads are narrow and have several tight bends and junctions. There are many dwellings tight to the narrow pavements.</p> <p>To suggest this is suitable for a freight route of any description would indicate that the author of this plan does not know the area.</p> <p>ii) The B 1042 leaves Potton and travels through Wrestlingworth. From the junction of Potton Road and High Street the route proceeds to the junction of High Street with Eyeworth & Tadlow Roads. The road is of variable width, again with some dwellings tight to the road. I believe that the road is of insufficient quality to support regular use by larger articulated vehicles. This is probably so through Potton as well. I fear long term damage to these properties, as well as to the neighbourhood and public safety.</p> <p>Yet this is the 'secondary freight route' which the LATP states <i>'seeks to focus freight trips on specific routes through the authority so as to minimise the impact on local communities'</i></p> <p>I believe that the minimal traffic surveys conducted have failed to show that we already have significant numbers of larger freight vehicles travelling through this route; not as suggested for access & deliveries but</p>	<p>The map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>1. Bicycle ownership and promotion In order to achieve a sustainable transport solution we need to ensure that we enable access for all modes of transport. There are many benefits for all road users if we can reduce the amount of single occupancy vehicles, road users. Encouraging and enabling cycling for those who do want to cycle is an integral part of sustainability.</p> <p>2. Biggleswade Eastern relief road A number of agreements are in place to provide the capacity to cater for the increase in number of journeys on the local transport network which will be generated as a result of the development to the east of Biggleswade. These agreements include proposals to improve walking and cycling infrastructure, improve public transport connections to the town centre as well as construct the new link road. The package of improvements secured by the authority will not just cater for the increase in demand</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>to 'cut the corner between the A1. & the A14 eastwards/M 11 intersection.</p> <p>In recent years the increased use of 'stat-nav' has increased this traffic as they seek an east/west route.</p> <p>As stated above the road is not of good enough standard to accommodate anything larger than an average van let alone the larger articulated lorries that use the route. Should these lorries meet through the High Street in Wrestlingworth there is insufficient room for them to pass with ease opting to mount the pavement or my front garden bank.</p> <p>I suspect the section through Potton described above is likewise affected; as evidenced by the continually dislodged kerbstones at the Sun Street/Royston Street junction.</p> <p>The LAMP for Biggleswade & Sandy may be fine for them but takes no account of the impact it may have on the surroundings, much of which is the catchment area for both towns' trade and commerce.</p> <p>Unless the surround areas are considered when implementing a transport plan it may well destroy the rural surrounds of both towns and they (Biggleswade & Sandy) will likewise suffer as a consequence; rendering the plan unnecessary.</p> <p>For safety of the residents of both sections (i) & (ii), for the preservation of the areas' existing character and the standing of Biggleswade & Sandy as focal points for the surrounding rural areas I suggest that the freight section of the LAMP be reconsidered.</p> <p>I am not alone in thinking that a more pro-active, perhaps radical, approach is needed to maintain the character of both Wrestlingworth and Potton their surroundings; vital to Biggleswade & Sandy.</p>	<p>to travel in the area but also increase the attractiveness of doing so by more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking and cycling.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment of the potential impact of the development on local roads has helped to inform the decision as to the point at which the new link road will be required, and as such the trigger point for its construction and opening. Every effort has been taken to ensure that the new development does not have a detrimental effect on the rest of the town, that it is well integrated in transport terms and that existing residents will be able to benefit from the improvements to infrastructure which will be provided as a consequence of the works undertaken by the developer.</p> <p>3) Journeys to the east of both Sandy & Biggleswade.</p> <p>The Journey to Work Evidence Base which forms Appendix A to the LTP details the nature and destination of all commuting trips from each town within Central Bedfordshire. This evidence base highlights that some 5-6% of Biggleswade and Sandy residents commute to Cambridgeshire for employment purposes, between 15-20% commute to Hertfordshire to the south of the towns, and over half of the local population work within Central Bedfordshire itself.</p> <p>With this in mind and the limit budget available to the authority to address the impacts of commuting on local communities, a decision was taken to prioritise investment in catering for shorter distance commuting trips, as opposed to longer distance trips which may require more investment and which may not generate the same value for money or target sufficient numbers of local residents.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Or perhaps they should prepare their own LAMP which undoubtedly would be in conflict with Biggleswade & Sandy's.</p> <p>Other points.</p> <p>1) It should be strongly born in mind that the Household survey carried out was limited in numbers of home canvassed and with even fewer replies. It is my experience that those replying to such surveys are not representative of the population. They tend will tend towards the fringes of the norm, being for example activists or have particular causes to champion. Caution always when analysing their views, not 'robust evidence'.</p> <p>2) Despite the supposed high percentage of bicycle ownership I see little evidence of this when journeying through Sandy or Biggleswade. The use may be more recreational, so whilst provision of the National Cycle way is merit worthy it will hardly assist traffic flow through both towns. Promotion of use of bicycles is perhaps fruitless, hardly practicable for the weekly shop; journeying to work when raining or if employed out of town.</p> <p>3) The Biggleswade Eastern Relief Road had been talked way before I started work in Biggleswade in the early 1980's! It is now materialising but if so important why has the agreement not required it's completion until after the first 700 new homes. So the first impact of this large area of expansion will be dogging the existing roads still further before any chance of 'relief'.</p> <p>4) There is no mention of journeys to the east of both Sandy & Biggleswade. I suggest that this is urgently taken into account. I am one of a considerable number who journey to the Cambridge/Royston areas</p>	<p>Notwithstanding this approach, longer distance commuting trips will be sought to be addressed through improvements to the access to the train stations in both Biggleswade and Sandy, and increasing the attractiveness of existing bus services to encourage more sustainable modes of travelling for commuters.</p> <p>4) There is no mention of journeys to the east of both Sandy & Biggleswade.</p> <p>The Journey to Work Evidence Base which forms Appendix A to the LTP details the nature and destination of all commuting trips from each town within Central Bedfordshire. This evidence base highlights that some 5-6% of Biggleswade and Sandy residents commute to Cambridgeshire for employment purposes, between 15-20% commute to Hertfordshire to the south of the towns, and over half of the local population work within Central Bedfordshire itself.</p> <p>With this in mind and the limit budget available to the authority to address the impacts of commuting on local communities, a decision was taken to prioritise investment in catering for shorter distance commuting trips, as opposed to longer distance trips which may require more investment and which may not generate the same value for money or target sufficient numbers of local residents.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this approach, longer distance commuting trips will be sought to be addressed through improvements to the access to the train stations in both Biggleswade and Sandy, and increasing the attractiveness of existing bus services to encourage more sustainable modes of travelling for commuters.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>& beyond for employment.</p> <p>5) It seems more and more apparent that the area to the east of Biggleswade & Sandy is the forgotten corner of Central Bedfordshire; see the above comments and my main response. For example the Central Beds website for bin collections, cannot get the streets in the right villages despite being advised twice, so little hope of this area getting any consideration in traffic matters</p> <p>6) Acknowledged the plan is in draft form but it doesn't inspire confidence in it when there are several mistakes on the contents page and the very first line of 1.1 is hardly professional. I stopped marking the errors and typing mistakes after page 5.</p>	<p>A number of agreements are in place to provide the capacity to cater for the increase in number of journeys on the local transport network which will be generated as a result of the development to the east of Biggleswade. These agreements include proposals to improve walking and cycling infrastructure, improve public transport connections to the town centre as well as construct the new link road. The package of improvements secured by the authority will not just cater for the increase in demand to travel in the area but also increase the attractiveness of doing so by more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking and cycling.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment of the potential impact of the development on local roads has helped to inform the decision as to the point at which the new link road will be required, and as such the trigger point for its construction and opening. Every effort has been taken to ensure that the new development does not have a detrimental effect on the rest of the town, that it is well integrated in transport terms and that existing residents will be able to benefit from the improvements to infrastructure which will be provided as a consequence of the works undertaken by the developer.</p> <p>5. Land east of Biggleswade local issues we will be working with local communities within the Wrestlingworth and Potton area during the development of the East Bedfordshire Local Area Transport Plan which is due to begin development in 2013. This will enable a programme of works to be specifically created to tackle local issues in your community.</p> <p>6. Spelling errors etc Noted. Since publication of the draft plan, we have made several changes including amendments, additions and</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		proof reading.
Bedfordshire Rural Communities Charity – 10/02/11	<p>I confirm the MVCRP wishes to see the following added to the draft document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the promotion and development of the Marston Vale Line (Bedford – Bletchley) through the Marston Vale Community Rail Partnership in readiness for the introduction of East West Rail services in 2017. • Support for the extension of the Marston Vale Line service to Sundays and Bank Holidays building on the successful pilots arranged by MVCRP • Support for the extension of the Marston Vale Line to Milton Keynes Central in 2013, following the Bletchley re-signalling <p>Support for the refurbishment of Ridgmont Station as a community multi-use centre and transport hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the work of the work of the East West Rail Consortium for the reinstatement of rail services between Bedford, Oxford and Cambridge. <p>However, the objectives of the Consortium in providing a strategic rail link between Central Southern and Eastern England will simply not be met unless Bedford is served from the Central Section route.</p> <p>Moreover, a through service via Bedford will be pivotal in enabling communities along the Marston Vale Line to make a single change to access destinations in the East of England. This will not be possible if services were to be routed via Luton, as has been proposed by the Consortium.</p> <p>It would extremely helpful if the need for the Central Section to service Bedford could be emphasized in the final document.</p> <p>MVCRP would also wish to see the inclusion of a mini Station Travel Plan covering Millbrook, Lidlington, Ridgmont and Aspley Guise in the</p>	<p>Changes to the LTP3 document have been made to show the authority's support for East-West Rail and the continued success of the Marston Vale Line.</p> <p>A change to the Access to Services Strategy has been made to include text on the Wheels to Work programme.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Marston Vale Local Area Transport Plan.</p> <p>We would also like some text to be included in the LTP3 to highlight the Wheels to Work Programme.</p> <p>I trust our response will be taken into consideration.</p>	
Long – 10/02/11 <i>via myjourney email</i>	<p>As the Director responsible for this draft LTP 3, I wish to respond directly to you. Whilst I welcome the opportunity to respond, I have numerous <i>serious</i> reservations about the document and its appendices in their present inadequate form.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It should be more accountable to local people. There are real issues over governance, trust and public opinion. Where and when has consumer representation been undertaken? 2. The local authority should have contacted, fully consulted and requested input from rail (& bus) operators, as well as from Network Rail; 3. Wider consultation should have taken place with more generous timescales for both measured input and responses; this should have included Town & Parish Councils, amongst others; 4. There is little reference to “joint working” and shared senior management teams (for example, across more than one council) – partnership with public transport operators; back-office & administration with adjoining local authorities; or following Eric Pickles/DCLG recent exhortations to adopt this innovative approach in the interests of efficiency, economy, more flexible & responsive services. Possible models for this may be the new South East Midlands LEP or the existing Beds Highways/Amey arrangements – for example, are contracts to be put out to tender for outsourcing with relevant external consultants, perhaps even for the transport planning/strategy responsibilities of the authority themselves?; 5. Despite being formed in April 2009, it has taken nearly two years for Central Beds to produce the draft LTP, with a very limited 	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>Whilst we understand that the timescales for comments on the main LTP3 Strategy were shorter than desired, there has been extensive consultation on LTP3 in its development. Full details can be found in our consultation report, but to give a summary this has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public exhibitions in locations across Central Bedfordshire • Feedback via Let's Talk Central, email, and other correspondence since May 2010 • Direct engagement with local communities in the areas covered by Local Area Transport Plans <p>In the future, we will be developing a Local Area Transport Plan for the Ampthill and Flitwick area, and common to the approach that we have taken in developing the existing Local Area Transport Plans we shall be working closely with local Town and Parish Councils and local stakeholders in developing the plans. We look forward to working with you in the development of your area's LATP during 2011/12.</p> <p><u>Flitwick Area</u></p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>time-period to respond;</p> <p>6. Linkage of transport policy to the changing public service landscape, to proposals for sustainable growth & economic development. The draft LTP appears to lack a holistic approach to land use planning/development control & transport planning in the unitary. The draft represents “more of the same” and has demonstrated little evidence of leadership, real change, a willingness to do things differently; or a response to meeting the aspirations and needs of the community. Where is the transformation that the creation of the unitary offered & was promised? Where is there real evidence of reducing overheads?</p> <p>7. Lack of strong commercial & entrepreneurial culture as demonstrated by the deficient content of the LTP. Failure to grasp good corporate governance practice in organization and delivery.</p> <p>8. In comparison to other (draft) English LTP 3s, Central Beds offering is weak, partial, poorly presented and lacking in real substance.</p> <p>9. I understand that the Bedford Commuters Association (BCA – a Rail User Group) sent a letter to the local authority regarding “Rail Issues in Central Bedfordshire” dated 13 August 2009, but that this has been ignored! There is, for example, no mention of “user groups” on page 27 of the draft document.</p> <p>10. Whilst the LTP may attempt to set out Central Bedfordshire Council’s policies, strategies and the way it will prioritise improvements over the coming years to address the transport related challenges and issues across the unitary, it does not adequately deal with public transport or with Ampthill/Flitwick (because no Local Area Transport Plan has been included for these towns in the first tranche appendices).</p> <p>11. The draft LTP fails to take account of the new Coalition Government’s emerging policies and the recent Spending Review, and as a plan seems to have ignored the current financial climate and its on-going ramifications.</p> <p>12. The draft LTP does not challenge orthodoxy – rising fuel prices/suppressed road traffic demand; over-budget road &</p>	<p>In the development of LTP3, we have taken a holistic view of a number of issues (not just transport) across the authority, and have sought to have the LTP3 document reflect these issues. Of particular interest was the development of the Local Area Transport Plans (LATPs), notably their scope and in what order they would be developed. The decision was taken by councillors that, due to the fact that these areas will be accommodating the majority of growth within the authority, that LATPs first be developed for Arlesey & Stotfold, Biggleswade & Sandy, Dunstable & Houghton Regis, and Leighton-Linslade.</p> <p>We accept that there are developments being planned in the Ampthill and Flitwick area, and for this purpose we will be producing a Local Area Transport Plan for Ampthill and Flitwick during 2011/12. Local stakeholders will be consulted with as part of the process of developing this LATP. You may also wish to note that, as part our programme of works for next year, we plan to deliver two junction improvements in the Flitwick area (at Millbrook and near Steppingley). These are for junction improvements to be delivered in association with the Centre Parcs plans.</p> <p><u>Policy Agenda</u></p> <p>LTP3 has been developed taking account of the emerging policy agenda from the Coalition Government. This has included ideas relating to localism and ‘the Big Society’ which has been a driving force behind developing the Local Area Transport Plans, emerging ideas on the Local Enterprise Partnerships, and the transport priorities of the Coalition as set out in <i>The Coalition – Our Programme for</i></p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>guided-busway schemes costing substantially more and taking much longer to deliver; wider transport objectives largely ignored; realistic cost & time estimates proving to be unattainable; carbon reduction strategies ignored; no car/lift-sharing pilot scheme or similar more sustainable initiative to be trialled.</p> <p>13. Central Bedfordshire is nebulous socio-economically and geographically without a predominant major population centre or county town. For employment, retailing, further education and other key services, it relies heavily on Bedford, Luton, Milton Keynes, Northampton & Cambridge (amongst other centres) so that out-commuting is a feature. This spatial hierarchy and population distribution is unlikely to change, suggesting Central Bedfordshire needs to co-operate very closely with its neighbouring adjacent local authorities and beyond its boundaries sub-regionally and within the LEP. There is no evidence in the draft LTP of this co-operation.</p> <p>14. Little is said in the draft about risk, compliance and reporting (on delivery).</p> <p>15. Transport Secretary Philip Hammond has said: "Following the spending review we challenged local authorities to look again at the cost of proposed schemes to ensure we get maximum value for every pound we spend. This will allow us to fund as many schemes as possible, delivering improvements to roads and public transport across the country." How will Central Bedfordshire meet this challenge from the Secretary of State?</p> <p>More serious is the lack of any meaningful consultation with stakeholders/consumers, or the rail industry itself, since the unitary was originally set up in April 2009. The local authority has also failed to attend any of the forums/meetings which the rail industry (and Passenger Focus/London Travelwatch) have organised - and to which their representatives were invited. This applies also to "Thameslink Consortium" meetings. Other local authorities have been more diligent in ensuring their key representatives attended these events – both at</p>	<p><i>Government (May 2010).</i></p> <p>Since the publication of the draft LTP3, more detailed transport guidance has been issued by the Department for Transport in the Local Transport White Paper <i>Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon</i>. LTP3 has been reviewed in light of this more detailed guidance, and appropriate changes have been made to LTP3.</p> <p>As we are sure you are aware, the policy agenda for transport and local government is still emerging. LTP3 will be reviewed in response to any significant changes arising from new Government policy.</p> <p><u>Corporate Governance</u></p> <p>We note your concerns regarding the corporate structure and governance behind LTP3. Whilst we note these concerns, it is the role of LTP3, as a statutory document, to set the priorities, aims, and objectives for transport in Central Bedfordshire. It is the responsibility of any governing structure to reflect and deliver these priorities, as opposed to LTP3 setting out the governance structure for delivery. None-the-less, LTP3 sets out a clear framework for the delivery of local transport schemes through the Local Area Transport Plans, which provide sufficient focus to deliver improvements locally. Any more details on the delivery mechanisms for schemes and other items included as part of LTP3 is not considered to be important enough to be set out in detail in a strategy document.</p> <p><u>Partnership working</u></p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>officer & elected member/portfolio holder level.</p> <p>Most other local authorities had their new draft LTPs circulating in late summer/early autumn last year. Not so with Central Beds. It has taken until January 2011 & responses then have to be back early February! Barely four weeks to respond! This guillotine is unacceptable, undemocratic and very unprofessional! It barely scrapes the surface of public consultation and is far removed from the spirit of due diligence.</p> <p>It is my understanding that Patrick O'Sullivan (Jacobs Consultancy/HCA) will respond in respect of the East-West Rail Link (EWRL) [pages 77 & 84-85], indicating how this rail scheme should be included in the LTP 3 and the central route section east of Bedford towards the ECML moved forward. This portion of route is within Central Bedfordshire. The EWRL Consortium (Neil Gibson, Chairman) may also have been in direct contact with Central Bedfordshire on the matter of Oxford – Bedford (EWRL Western Section), in addition to east of Bedford.</p> <p>I believe that Central Beds should show support in their LTP for Midland Main Line (MML) electrification & for EWRL, and to lobby (in conjunction with other local authorities) for delivery of these vital rail schemes. There is no mention in the LTP of working with its rail partners, but the draft document is fulsome in respect of co-operation with the Highways Agency - M1 hard shoulder running/widening, A5/M1 link road, Junction 13 remodelling, other trunk road schemes, etc.</p> <p>The same could also be said about the similar lack of commitment to public transport - to bus and rail operators. No mention either of the provision of safe, integrated & efficient rail services that facilitate easy interchange with bus services & other modes of transport and that meet the travel needs of (Central Beds) public transport users! Have Taxi-buses been explored which could serve local railway stations?</p>	<p>LTP3 has a very strong focus on partnership working, which is considered to be of vital importance to the successful delivery of LTP3. Central Bedfordshire Council is committed to working effectively in partnership with public transport operators, surrounding local authorities, local communities, and many more stakeholders in the delivery of LTP3 schemes, and in the development of further strategies and Local Area Transport Plans.</p> <p>With regards to the links between transport and land use planning, LTP3 has been developed with significant input from planning colleagues, and has taken account of existing and emerging land use policies. Most notably this is through the existing Core Strategy for the Northern Area, the emerging Core Strategy for the South Bedfordshire and Luton Area, and the recent Site Allocations Document. The Transport Strategy also provides significant input in the development of planning policies.</p> <p>The integration between land use and transport policy is shown in the main LTP3 Strategy document, particularly in the 'Wider Issues and Opportunities', 'Strategic Approach', and 'Objectives and Priorities' sections. Land Use Planning is also identified as a key intervention for delivery, and the Local Area Transport Plans identify a number of schemes already being delivered through planning obligations.</p> <p><u>Rail and Public Transport Issues</u></p> <p>We note your comments concerning improvements to rail</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Following the cancellation (of the former Bedfordshire County Council/Mid Beds Station/Car Parking meetings - last one, 3rd March 2009), there is no hint either in the draft LTP about the improvement of local rail services (for example, Marston Vale Line/Milton Keynes extension, etc.) and of railway stations/station car parking, and to make these train services and their stations accessible for all customers. Over the period of the Local Transport Plan one of Central Bedfordshire's (public) transport objectives should be to see improvements to the rail infrastructure. For example, is it working in partnership with Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies (TOCs) to improve access to rail stations?</p> <p>Just a few of the serious failings in the Central Beds draft LTP. Examination of adjoining local authority draft LTP 3s (and those further afield) would have illustrated how it was possible to go about the whole exercise professionally and with careful due diligence!</p> <p>It is strongly suggested that the following are included in the LTP 3 in respect of RAIL TRAVEL. The aim being to encourage the use of rail as an attractive and viable travel choice, the Council, in partnership with Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies, will seek : -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The provision of safe, integrated and efficient rail services that facilitate easy interchange with bus services and other modes of transport and that meet the travel needs of rail customers. 2 The improvement of local and inter-city trains (rolling stock) and of stations in Central Beds to make these accessible (as defined in the DDA) for all customers. "Access for All" initiative. The Council should work with the Train Operating Companies to deliver improvements to access and facilities at <u>all</u> railway stations within the unitary authority. 3 The adoption of Station Travel Plans following that at Leighton Buzzard (Leighton Buzzard was selected as one of 31 pilot 	<p>and public transport in Central Bedfordshire, and we welcome these comments. With regards to your specific comments:</p> <p><i>Support for rail schemes</i></p> <p>Changes to LTP3 have been made to include further text, and highlight our support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East West Rail • Extension of Marston Vale Line services to Milton Keynes Central • The Thameslink Programme • The Wixams Station • Midland Mainline Electrification. <p><i>Promoting rail and Station Travel Plans</i></p> <p>LTP3 contains strong support for smarter travel choices and for travel planning. Central Bedfordshire Council is keen to promote public transport as part of LTP3 and its Local Sustainable Transport Fund Bid. The Council is also keen to work with rail operators to promote local rail travel.</p> <p>Station Travel Plans are currently being considered as an item to form part of a Local Sustainable Transport Fund Bid, alongside other smarter choices measures. Development of future Station Travel Plans in Central Bedfordshire are likely to depend upon the outcomes of this bid, and the experience of the Leighton Buzzard Station Travel Plan.</p> <p><i>Integration between bus and rail</i></p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Station Travel Plan schemes in 2008). It is strongly suggested that Flitwick should be the next <i>Station Travel Plan</i> to be produced by the local authority [pages 30-31 & 51].</p> <p>4 Appropriate marketing of rail services in conjunction with other initiatives such as ticketing and customer information improvements.</p> <p>5 To help rail services perform a key role in supporting & enhancing the economic vitality of Central Beds.</p> <p>The Council should also :</p> <p>6 Support the delivery of the <i>Thameslink Programme</i> in conjunction with the rail industry, following Philip Hammond's announcement in November 2010. They should ensure that on both the Thameslink & Great Northern routes of First Capital Connect (FCC), better station facilities include improved cycle storage and car parking, "kiss-&-ride" spaces on the forecourts, improved safety, security, and customer information & waiting facilities, and to ensure that stations are fully accessible for all rail users. To consider in this context joint or 'match-funding' to deliver improvements under the National Stations Improvement Programme, Access for All, or similar schemes – which spread the costs.</p> <p>7 Support "Gateway Station" improvements – for example, the redevelopment of the main rail hub at Bedford (Midland) station including the Bedford Station Quarter Redevelopment (BSQR). Important, given interchange between FCC Thameslink, London Midland 'Marston Vale' and East Midlands Trains services. Plus it's potential along the proposed East-West Rail Link, including future Oxford – Bedford train services.</p> <p>8 Support proposals for the extension of the Marston Vale Line Bedford – Bletchley passenger train service to operate to/from Milton Keynes Central, following the Bletchley re-signalling [page 14]. To assist the Community Rail Partnership in raising the profile of the MVL train service.</p> <p>9 Support proposals for the proposed new station at The Wixams (planning application 10/02805/MAF submitted to Bedford</p>	<p>Central Bedfordshire Council is committed to working in partnership with local public transport operators to provide an enhanced, seamless public transport experience. This is reflected in LTP3, and will be developed further in the production of the Public Transport Strategy for LTP3, which is being produced during 2011/12.</p> <p><i>Rail Freight</i></p> <p>Following comments from the promoters of the Sundon Rail Freight Interchange, amendments have been made to LTP3 and the Freight Strategy to reflect the current situation on this rail freight interchange, and to highlight the Council's 'in principle' support for rail freight. As further rail freight opportunities arise, Central Bedfordshire Council will work with promoters in the development of these schemes.</p> <p>Regarding the specific proposals for Rookery Pit South, you will no doubt have read with interest Central Bedfordshire Council's submission to the Infrastructure Planning Commission's Inquiry. To include this specific development proposal at this stage of LTP3 would be premature. However, this will be reviewed following any subsequent decisions on this particular development.</p> <p>We thank you once again for your comments. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact us.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Borough Council, 12 November 2010 and registered 23 January 2011). J.J. Gallagher & WCEC.</p> <p>10 Support proposals for future electrification of the Midland Main Line north from Bedford.</p> <p>11 Support proposals for the East-West Rail Link (EWRL) and to lobby for this to be extended eastwards, via its central section, towards the East Coast Main Line, Cambridge & East Anglia. To give every assistance to the East-West Consortium and to work with it in a timely delivery of EWRL, including any financial contribution that this requires. To help deliver EWRL through Growth Area Funding (or similar) & through the South East Midlands LEP. Protect the track-bed (safeguarding through the planning process) of any former rail alignments which may be required for the EWRL route east of Bedford.</p> <p>12 Provide safe, integrated and efficient bus services that permit easy interchange with other modes of transport (but particularly with rail) and that meet the travel needs of customers who choose not to use, or are unable to use, a private car. To extend the Leighton Buzzard <i>Station Travel Plan</i> concept elsewhere within Central Bedfordshire.</p> <p>13 To examine strategic alliances which could help deliver a "Quality Rail Partnership" (similar to that recently introduced in Hertfordshire). What is the model for service delivery in Central Bedfordshire and how can it be improved upon?</p> <p>14 To examine (in conjunction with others) the potential operation of "Tram-Train" or Parry People Mover (PPM). A possible route could be Luton – Dunstable, if this is a cheaper & more viable option than the proposed guided busway. Please note Cheshire East Council's recent inclusion in their LTP 3 of Tram-Train operation for the (Manchester) – Altrincham – Chester railway line and potential other routes, as an example. Also note Hertfordshire County Council's proposals for converting heavy rail to light rail operation on the Watford Junction – St. Albans Abbey line (the Abbey Line CRP).</p> <p>15 To consider "match-funding" in conjunction with Network Rail & the Train Operating Companies to bring railway stations up to a</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>more acceptable standard, including accessibility (DDA compliance, etc.).</p> <p>16 To link emerging "Town Centre Masterplans" (e.g., Flitwick, Leighton Buzzard, Biggleswade) with improvements at those town's railway stations which are important "railheads" [page 51].</p> <p>17 To seek to minimise the future transport impacts of population and housing growth, Central Beds should work through the planning system (LDF & LTP) to : -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deliver new developments that are well-served by walking, cycling and public transport (for example, the proposed new railway station at The Wixams). • ensure that new housing developments are supported by the appropriate range of local work/employment opportunities and essential facilities. <p>18 Central Bedfordshire's long-term strategy should contain six long-term transport objectives indicating its priorities in each case. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i to effectively manage and maintain its transport system and its assets ii to enable economic and population growth, whilst minimising impacts on its transport system and environment iii to encourage and enable more active and sustainable ways to travel iv to improve the connectivity and accessibility of its transport system v to continue to reduce road casualties and improve road safety vi to reduce the negative impacts of travel and transport on people, settlements and the natural environment (for example, Lorry Routing page 63 and Access Restrictions page 70; Shared Space; Quiet Lanes; speed management; 20 mph speed limits 	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>in residential areas and outside primary schools; traffic calming; illegal parking; workplace parking levy; safe routes to school, cycle-lanes, etc.).</p> <p>LTP 3 should aim to provide a transport system within Central Beds that offers real choice in alternatives to the car. For example, rail services in Central Beds encourage the use of a sustainable mode. Central Beds should therefore help the rail industry on its respective key routes between and into the main urban centres - such as Bedford, Luton & Milton Keynes; and on the Great Northern side, Peterborough, Huntingdon, Hitchin & Stevenage, etc. The significance of London commuting (and the wider south east) should not be forgotten, especially given the wider spread of services to be offered by the "Thameslink Programme".</p> <p><u>Strategic Rail Freight</u> (pages 54 & 76-77)</p> <p>In addition to passenger services, the rail lines in Central Beds are also well used by rail freight. The Council should support the use of rail for the sustainable distribution of freight. This will require rail freight terminals – and potential locations which should be examined (and safeguarded) are Ridgmont (Amazon); Rookery South (Covanta); Sundon (ProLogis/AMB Property). It is strongly suggested that Central Beds consult with the 'Rail Freight Group'.</p> <p>The former Sundon Quarry site (ex. Blue Circle Cement/Lafarge) is being promoted by ProLogis/AMB Property for a proposed Rail Freight Interchange (RFI). This site is located directly adjacent to the proposed new junction 11a on the M1 and the 'to be built' A5/M1 link road, which it is understood will connect North Luton and North Dunstable to the M1 & A5. The proposal is for 157,930 m² (1.7 million ft²) of warehousing in four units. The developers draft scheme includes one rail-linked warehouse and an intermodal terminal, but due to the topography the other</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>warehouses on site would not be directly rail-linked.</p> <p>Existing rail freight terminals at Forders Sidings (Stewartby), Elstow (stone/aggregate terminal), Biggleswade (Plasmor) & Leagrave (Limbury Road) may offer an opportunity for expansion and additional traffic. This could be important for sand & gravel traffic, especially to ensure a sufficient supply of aggregates in the future (ref. Carter Jonas <i>Mineral Report</i>, January 2011).</p> <p>In respect of Rookery South, it is important that a rail freight facility is incorporated should the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) approve a "Development Consent Order" for Covanta Energy. In the national press on 3rd February 2011 there is the Legal Notice for the proposed Brig Y Cwm Energy from Waste Facility by Covanta at Merthyr Tydfil, South Wales. Like Rookery South this application to the IPC is for a 'Development Consent Order' to build the facility. Under the project description for Merthyr there is : "new rail sidings & connections to the existing railway line; reach stackers for loading & unloading waste containers; and a container storage area".</p> <p>In respect of Rookery South <u>NO</u> rail facility or associated works is contained within the application to the IPC and it is Covanta's intention to only use HGVs at that facility!</p> <p>A preliminary hearing of the IPC Commissioners has already been held in respect of Rookery South (January 2011). On the morning of 4th February 2011 the IPC Commissioners made a site visit to the proposed location of Rookery South - between Stewartby & Millbrook stations on the Marston Vale railway line (Bedford - Bletchley/EWRL). The Midland Main Line is also adjacent to the Covanta site on its eastern side.</p> <p>American waste firm Covanta Energy has indicated that Rookery South's proposed incinerator will burn 600,000 tonnes of waste a year. It is even</p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>more curious that Rookery South will not be rail-served, as until quite recently the "Bin-Liner" train operated from Cricklewood to Forders Sidings (Stewartby) with household waste from London Boroughs/GLA.</p> <p>One can only assume that in the case of Merthyr Tydfil the local authority & Welsh Assembly insisted on the plant being rail-served, but that in Central Beds (& Bedford Borough) the local planning authorities are ambivalent! Will Central Bedfordshire correct this anomaly?</p> <p><u>Flitwick Railway Station.</u></p> <p>I am particularly concerned as a Flitwick resident of long standing, that the draft LTP 3 makes no mention of the "improvements" at Flitwick railway station (either in conjunction with the Town Centre Masterplan [pages 30-31 & 51], or separate from it – as an enhancement to the "Thameslink Programme" work of platform lengthening to allow for accommodation of 12-car trains. This is curious, given that I understood a GAF bid had gone forward from Central Beds in respect of Flitwick!</p> <p>More glaring however, is the lack of a "Local Area Transport Plan" for Ampthill/Flitwick. Are Central Beds uncertain about what to include in it? I am personally aware of the proposed (large) housing developments adjacent to the Rufus Centre & the Ampthill bypass (Ampthill Heights); the Town Centre Regeneration proposals; the Woburn Forest Holiday Village (Centre Parcs) development; the Football Centre (of excellence) opposite Redbourne Upper School; the recently published (by Central Beds) draft Housing Strategy - which has an impact locally; and the proposals for a Flitwick-Westoning bypass (no detail for the latter in the draft LTP). The future of the Flitwick Leisure Centre has still to be clarified.</p> <p>Along with others I am seriously concerned that Ampthill/Flitwick appears to have been largely ignored by the LTP document. Not</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>satisfactory, given its population size, Council Tax & Business Rate revenue, amongst other key considerations.</p> <p>An examination of the Appendices of the draft LTP 3 shows 'Local Area Transport Plans' as follows for other key settlements in the unitary authority :</p> <p>Appendix J - Arlesey and Stotfold Local Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Appendix K - Biggleswade and Sandy Local Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Appendix L - Dunstable and Houghton Regis Local Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Appendix M - Leighton-Linslade Local Area Transport Plan</p> <p>I might be forgiven, but I had assumed that Ampthill/Flitwick should have been accorded the same status as these other main population centres and growth points within Central Beds. Why were these two important towns excluded?</p> <p>Why has no Local Area Transport Plan been drafted for Ampthill/Flitwick? Why are our communities obviously considered less significant than the others? What is the reason(s) for us not having one? Perhaps a full & considered explanation would be helpful, given the land use and transport (planning) issues which equally apply here!</p> <p>Significantly too, mention is made in the draft LTP 3 of major Highway Agency (HA) trunk road schemes (e.g., M1 hard shoulder running & A5/M1 link) but no mention whatsoever of Network Rail schemes - i.e., the Thameslink Programme, the proposed new railway station at The Wixams, or Midland Main Line electrification. The Thameslink Programme is going ahead in full, following Philip Hammond's announcement on 25th November 2010. Why has this largely been ignored? Do Central Beds believe there will be no impact from this rail scheme on the Thameslink route & Great Northern (GN) route stations/station car parks within Central Beds? The GN route stations are equally important, offering access to Huntingdon, Peterborough,</p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Hitchin & Stevenage, aside from London commuting.</p> <p>These are significant & inexcusable failings, suggesting little thought or professional care/prudent management has been given to the draft LTP 3!</p> <p>More oddly though is the fact that the Ampthill/Flitwick "Let's Talk Together" stakeholder consultation is at Redbourne Upper School & Community College in MARCH 2011, yet Central Beds want all responses back on LTP 3 by early February! So in addition to excluding Ampthill/Flitwick from the Local Area Transport Plan process, it is also effectively excluded as a community from serious input into the draft LTP (because no doubt by March it will be too late for changes to be made to the contents of the LTP 3 submission).</p> <p>Only three main factors (in transport strategy) appear to be driving Central Beds :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Highways Agency M1 widening/hard-shoulder running north of Junction 11); 2. The Luton - Dunstable guided busway; 3. The A5/M1 link road - Dunstable Northern Bypass - & new interchange with the M1 motorway at Junction 11A/Chalton. <p>More curious is the fact that unlike other "best practice" local authorities Central Beds appear to have made no attempt to identify priorities from individual Parish & Town Plans. Indeed, have they even asked (locally in my case) Flitwick Town Council or Ampthill Town Council for their views?</p> <p>Certainly it was not impossible for Central Beds to have undertaken the following (which they appear NOT to have done) :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a Transport Policy Task Group, comprised of elected members & lay representatives (some of whom could have represented 	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>specific "User Groups" : Bus, Rail, Taxi, Cycle, Pedestrian, etc.);</p> <p>2. Circulate all Officers within Central Beds; the Highways Agency; Network Rail; Train Operating Companies; the Rail Freight Group, Bus Companies (Stagecoach, Grant Palmer, Arriva, Centre Bus, Cedar Coaches, etc.); Passenger Focus, LondonTravelWatch, etc.</p> <p>3. Parish Planning event workshops;</p> <p>4. Consultation with individual Parish & Town Councils;</p> <p>5. Consultation with stakeholders (for example : BBRUA, BCA, BABUS, Cyclists, Pedestrians, Ramblers, Horse Riders, the MVL Community Rail Partnership, etc.).</p> <p>Sadly Central Beds have not approached the process in a meaningful manner, despite having had nearly two years (April 2009 onwards) to do so!</p> <p>Aside from the lack of any really useful content in the LTP 3, the whole methodology has been flawed. How can this blatant failure be excused?</p> <p>Presumably Central Bedfordshire will be collating the views of all those who have responded to the draft and will be using the information to inform the final LTP 3. It would therefore be most helpful if Central Bedfordshire produces a consultation summary document and circulates this to all respondents in Spring/Summer 2011 following the adoption of the finished LTP. No doubt the finished document will also be available on the web.</p> <p>Thanking you for your kind attention. Please acknowledge receipt of this response submission.</p> <p><i>Additional appendices have also been included in the response, but have not been printed in full here. The key issues in these Appendices were:</i></p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p><i>East West Rail (an update on progress with the East West Rail Scheme)</i></p> <p><i>Thameslink Programme (additional suggested text developed in consultation with Central Bedfordshire Council)</i></p> <p><i>Wixams Station (additional suggested text developed in consultation with Central Bedfordshire Council)</i></p> <p><i>Midland Mainline Electrification (additional suggested text developed in consultation with Central Bedfordshire Council)</i></p> <p><i>South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership (stating SEMLEP should help Central Bedfordshire, and may help to develop schemes such as East West Rail and Midland Mainline Electrification)</i></p>	
Flitwick at the crossroads resident action group – 09/02/11	<p>If this document is intended to be a comprehensive analysis and offer prescriptive solutions to the transport problems and needs of the whole of Central Beds, then it fails entirely. If it is not, then it should say so at the outset. Its tardy publication with very little time offered for comment, and the way it is presented, suggests that it is a fait accompli with the only areas that matter being those of Arlesey and Stotfold, Biggleswade and Sandy, Dunstable and Houghton Regis, and Leighton-Linslade with any prior consultation with stakeholders purely devoted to these areas. The Flitwick and Ampthill area, arguably just as much of significance as the four dassed as 'priorities', is referenced only very briefly towards the end of the document and only to the extent that a Local Area Transport Plan for this and remaining areas of Central Beds will be undertaken later.</p> <p>We would argue that to focus as the document does is meaningless without a holistic examination of the entire area of CBC's responsibility, and indeed without taking into account developments in the wider region and beyond. If any subject must be considered in the round it must be transport; and any development plans in our region, such as Town Centre Regeneration Plans, major new facilities such as the Covanta proposals for a massive energy from waste and materials recovery facility, the CenterParcs Development, and the rail Thameslink Programme, will have wide implications which should be tackled head-on and be subject to proper consultation and discussion.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for the comments that you sent to us on behalf of the Flitwick at the Crossroads Residents Action Group. We have considered these comments (alongside with those of others) as part of our consultation on Local Transport Plan 3. Our response to these comments are given below:</p> <p>Local Area Transport Plan for Flitwick</p> <p>In the development of LTP3, we have taken a holistic view of a number of issues (not just transport) across the authority, and have sought to have the LTP3 document reflect these issues. Of particular interest was the development of the Local Area Transport Plans (LATPs), notably their scope and in what order they would be developed. The decision was taken by councillors that, due to the fact that these areas will be accomodating the majority of growth within the authority, that LATPs first be developed for Arlesey & Stotfold, Biggleswade & Sandy, Dunstable & Houghton Regis, and Leighton-Linslade.</p> <p>We accept that there are developments being planned in the Ampthill and Flitwick area, and for this purpose we will be producing a Local Area Transport Plan for Ampthill and</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Furthermore the document, while paying lip service to the concept of integrated and environmentally responsible transport systems, seems to be describing a love affair with the private car and road freight, and does not tackle properly the social exclusion afforded to the many who are disadvantaged by this concentration.</p> <p>The plans outlined in this glossy and lengthy peroration put the cart before the horse. CBC should endeavour to do better to provide residents with confidence that the interests of us all are being pursued.</p>	<p>Flitwick during 2011/12. As a key local stakeholder group, the Flitwick at the Crossroads Residents Action Group will be consulted with as part of the process of developing this LATP. You may also wish to note that, as part our programme of works for next year, we plan to deliver two junction improvements in the Flitwick area (at Millbrook and near Steppingley). These are for junction improvements to be delivered in association with the Centre Parcs plans</p> <p>Focus on private car and road freight</p> <p>LTP3 does place a significant emphasis on non-car modes of transport as part of how it will deliver its vision, and tackle the issue that you mentioned regarding social exclusion. One of the key themes running through LTP3 is about improving access to services such as healthcare, retail, and leisure, and the interventions that we have planned in the Local Area Transport Plan have been planned to take account of this need. In addition to this some of our main interventions such as smarter choices, information and infrastructure, and network management have a significant focus on non-car modes of transport. Once again, this is reflected in the schemes that have been included in the LATPs.</p> <p>The exact schemes to promote non-car modes of transport have and are being developed as part of the LATPs, as we believe that each location is different and thus requires different interventions. The 4 current LATPs have a significant proportion of funding allocated to walking, cycling, bus, and other integrated transport schemes. We would hope to adopt a similar approach to Ampthill and Flitwick, in consultation with the local community.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
		<p>In addition to this, you may already be aware that since the Draft LTP3 was published, we have made further amendments to include major rail infrastructure schemes such as Thameslink and the Wixams Station. Amendments to the Freight Strategy will also highlight the potential for Rail Freight Interchanges in Central Bedfordshire.</p> <p>We are sure that you can understand that it is Central Bedfordshire's role as a highway authority to consider all modes of transport as part of LTP3, hence why we have included sections on Freight and on the management of vehicular traffic. But we hope that we have assured you that other modes of transport form an integral part of LTP3.</p> <p>If you have any further questions on any aspect of the Local Transport Plan, then please feel free to contact us.</p>
Toddington Parish Council – 07/02/11	<p>Toddington Parish Council's Response Local Transport Plan 3 Consultation</p> <p>We understand that this is the first stage in a long process and that as Parish we should be more involved in specific areas related to us in the consultation in 2013/2014. At this stage in the process we would like to make the following comments. Appendices C in the consultation relating to Travel to School. This refers to reducing vehicles journey to school. We believe that if the Local Authority takes away the School Patrolling/crossing personnel, then it is likely that increased vehicles will be on the road as parents will feel it safer to drive their children to school rather than walk, therefore increasing the possibility of further congestion on the local networks which you are trying to reduce.</p> <p>Section 70 – Access Restriction. As soon as the A5 M1 link road is complete Toddington Parish Council wish to see HGV restrictions on the</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>A5120, bridleway and junction with the link road.</p> <p>P.22 Transport and the Economy – Here it is envisaged the need for an efficient and well connected transport network is a key to a thriving community – Toddington Parish Council believe this is an essential requirement for additional local buses to coordinate with the rails services, but feel that this would not be achievable if Central Bedfordshire cut bus subsidies in the near future.</p> <p>P44. Journey to Work - We do not feel there is sufficient evidence to support the correct connectivity of Bus-Trains and their needs to be an increase in the amount of bus's available at the appropriate times through the day/evening, to support commuters for this to work.</p> <p>P76 Park and Ride – The Parish Council feel that unless the current bus service's are improved and times to suit everyone this service will not work sufficiently.</p> <p>Please take our comments into full consideration</p>	
<p>Harlington Parish Council – 11/02/11</p>	<p>Harlington Parish Council has reviewed the Local Transport Plan 3 - My Journey document and has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 103 pages is an awful lot to go through, especially when it takes 37 pages before one finds what the LTP objectives are. Whatever happened to the executive style summary that was discussed a couple of years ago that allows the reader to get the overall concepts of the consultation sorted and then dip into the detail where appropriate? ▪ A longer consultation period would have allowed meaningful discussion at Parish Council level. ▪ Overall, as a broad strategy, it is very sensible, with clear objectives. Wording of the document is clear and easy to understand. The key themes of 'integration' and 'sustainability' come through strongly. However <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - links to Appendix G - Public Transport Information Strategy (of 	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>particular relevance to Harlington) and Appendix H - Car Parking Strategy appear to be missing on the site;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are not enough details on what, and how and when it will be achieved, and where the money will come from; - Maps in the document are not clear, nor in enough detail, even when enlarged. - The term 'Kiss and Ride' site (page 76) is inappropriate; and - Under 'Major Schemes' there is mention of a 'Flitwick-Westoning' bypass (page 80), but no further details could be found. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is an ambitious plan cost wise, particularly with current cost cutting, removal of rural bus services and the building of new homes in future. Has enough capacity been built in? ▪ 'Enable access to health care' needs to be a major priority. With no hospitals in Central Beds it is unacceptable that there is a 46 minute journey by public transport when it is a 30 minute national average (page 23). With the 85+ population doubling by 2031, and an increased population from the 22,500 new houses in South Beds, there will also need to be very speedy road access to hospitals for emergencies. [Although not directly related to a transport plan, are there any plans to build a new hospital in Central Beds?]. ▪ Under 'Out Commuting Trips' page 45, it mentions that 1 in 20 of all jobs are in London and this is greater in rural areas. Then on page 84 it mentions that Luton North Station may entail the closing of Harlington or Leagrave Stations. So how would these 'rural' commuters get into London? ▪ Harlington appears to be on a Designated Road Freight Network as a Secondary Freight Route (page 72). ▪ M1 Junction 11A and the new road links should take some of the traffic away from M1 Junction 12, which is good, but the timeframe and funding for Junction 11A is not clear. ▪ In Appendix D - Freight, Ampthill and Flitwick are shown as Minor Service Centres under 'Growth Areas'. No specific details are given. What does this entail? ▪ Also in Appendix D Sundon is mentioned as a suitable area for a rail freight terminal. There is no transport plan, or new roads mentioned 	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>if this were to happen. Is there money available for it? Life in Sundon would be irrevocably changed with increased noise and traffic not only from the rail freight terminal, but also the Luton Northern Bypass.</p> <p>Harlington has concerns of over development all around it which is perceived as not being part of the plan for the village – surely an integrated transport plan should be integrated with all concerned and certainly any affects on Junction 12 and the railway will have knock on effects on Harlington’s own access issues to either work, health provision, shops, leisure etc. Increases in traffic or rail freight will also have noise impact.</p> <p>With the recent financial constraints there could be a lot of development with a lack of infrastructure to actually support it. Relying on development to fund roads is inappropriate, as the suitability of the development could potentially be looked at in a secondary fashion – prioritising the roads which cannot be funded any other way.</p> <p>In general, a healthier life style by more walking and cycling etc is not going to be helped if the proposed CBC cuts to various budgets materialise. Removal of the Crossing Patrol, for example, could easily result in children being taken to school in cars for their safety and this undermines the efforts of the Travel To School initiatives. Reducing public transport and removing mobile libraries will create problems for many people that could result in more use of cars in some cases and no use of a public library for others.</p>	
Leighton-Linslade Town Council Sustainable Transport Committee	<p>RESOLVED that Leighton-Linslade Town Council’s response to the Local Area Transport Plan 3 be:</p> <p>(a) The need for school zebra crossings to be actually in place</p>	LATP amended following confirmation from CBC local members.

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>prior to any withdrawal of the school crossing patrol service</p> <p>(b) Hockliffe Street from the Market Square to the roundabout on Leston Road might not be suitable for the creation of a shared space scheme</p> <p>(c) More and appropriately sized disabled parking spaces were required within the town centre</p> <p>(d) Access issues regarding the present shared use of pavements by vehicles and pedestrians need to be resolved</p> <p>(e) Issues still remained regarding traffic flow and safety concerns at the junction of Billington Road and Grovebury Road</p> <p>(f) concern that the Eastern Distributor Road is mentioned only in the main document and not referenced in the Local Area Transport Plan for Leighton-Linslade. Furthermore, that the road is referred to as running from Heath Road to Stanbridge Road rather than to the A505. The Committee reiterated the view of Council that it would be impossible to support any development to the East of the town without this relief road from the A505 bypass through to Heath Road</p> <p>(g) The need for “end to end” cycle routes, in particular to schools so that the confidence of cyclists using the highway would be improved</p>	
The CTC, 09/02/11 – email myjourney	<p>In general I fully support the principles and aspirations, as detailed in both the LTP Plan 3 Draft and the supporting Appendix F, covering Cycling Strategy. However, if the aims of the cycling strategies are going to be achieved, based on the experiences of similar adopted aspirations by previous administrations, there needs to be a far greater commitment to implementation.</p> <p>In 2001 the Mid Bedfordshire District Council adopted a Cycle Mapping Project, which detailed a network of safe cycling routes between and within townships in its domain. Ten years later, very few of the schemes have been implemented, especially within my local Ampthill and Flitwick area. Many of the schemes were quite modest, often involving only the erection of signage, rather than major physical work.</p>	<p>Dear Alan.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments in response to the Draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire. We appreciate your general support of the Plan and will seek to continue working with the CTC in the implementation of schemes on the ground. With regard to specific points that you raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LTP forms the authority's commitment to improving conditions for cycling over the Plan



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>One problem facing MBDC was the fact that although it was the planning authority, it did not control the financial strings, which were a Bedfordshire County Council responsibility. The transition to unitary local government now places adopted aspirations and financing under a single authority.</p> <p>Although at the working level, there is a solid dedication to improve the cycling environment, I remain to be convinced that at higher level, both with senior council officers and elected councillors, there is the same level of commitment to achieve adopted policies.</p> <p>A key section within the LTP Plan 3 document relates to the Preference Hierarchy, summarised on Page 35. Cycling is designated as the top priority travel mode for journeys of 2-5 miles. Walking is the top priority travel mode for journeys of 0-2 miles. Possibly the threshold distance between walking and cycling should be closer to one mile. Most journeys involve out-and-back travel. Walking four miles in a day is quite challenging and time-consuming.</p> <p>The quest to persuade motorists into their cars for short journeys is highly commendable. Unfortunately the current perception by many residents is that cycling is a perilous mode of travel. Superficially, most people believe that "the roads are dangerous for cyclists".</p> <p>The danger perception is partly myth, partly reality. Certainly cyclists do have to face specific challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some infrastructure creates a poor cycling environment, particularly roundabouts and pinch-points, such as traffic islands. A few years ago, a cycle infrastructure specialist gave a presentation to the BEDS CC Cycle Forum. None of the multitude of cycle-friendly layouts featured a roundabout. • A small minority of drivers behave with a disregard for the safety of cyclists. The main misdemeanours are overtaking too closely, sometimes within touching distance, and overtaking and immediately turning left. With such a high level of traffic in most townships, the chance of an occasional frightening encounter is almost inevitable. These incidents definitely deter inexperienced cyclists from using cycling as their travel mode for short distances. 	<p>period. The vision of the Plan refers to the development of a safe and sustainable transport system, whilst a number of the objectives relate to the need to improve access via sustainable modes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to the preference hierarchy has been removed from the LTP. It is felt that there is sufficient emphasis on promoting walking and cycling throughout the document, whilst both the pedestrian and cycle network hierarchies established as a concept within the respective appendices, and the precise routes of which have been detailed within the Local Area Transport Plans form a clear steer as to investment priorities. • The enforcement of traffic speeds is the responsibility of the Police. The authority will seek to work closely with the Police through the delivery of the Road Safety Strategy which forms another of the appendices of the Plan, addressing each of the three "e's" associated with reducing the number of people killed or seriously injured – engineering measures, enforcement and education. • The approach of the Plan is such that it seeks to create an environment where cyclists and motorists should be able to co-exist. This may be through the provision of 'shared space' in some locations, the reallocation of road space in others and general road space and speed management measures where appropriate. <p>We hope that these comments help clarify the position of the authority on the cycle related matters you have raised, and once again thank you for taking the time out to</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The low level of road traffic law enforcement means that bad behaviour towards cyclists by drivers is unlikely to be detected, especially away from main routes. More extensive enforcement of the traffic laws is desirable, but probably the police resource is insufficient to make a major impact. In an age of budget cuts, speed cameras in 30 mph areas must be retained. Rural roads and lanes are becoming a danger area for cyclists, since law enforcement is virtually non-existent and vehicle speeds can be high. A growing hazard for cyclists is the use of mobile phones by drivers, despite the stricter laws imposed in the last few years. Too many drivers know that the chance of being caught is low. From experience, the close-passing driver often appears to be using a mobile phone. Again, an increasing vulnerability for cyclists from this law infringement is along rural roads and lanes. Other than the main routes through townships, all roads within residential areas should be restricted to 20 mph. For reasons beyond my understanding, signage of cycle routes, whether on the normal carriageway or off-road is often overlooked. Signage not only encourages cyclists, but also makes drivers aware of the presence of cyclists. <p>In general, cyclists and motorists should be able to co-exist on the same carriageway, especially in 30 mph areas. Where land-space permits, dedicated off-road cycle paths are desirable. On-road cycle lanes are a dilemma. Often they are provided along safer stretches, and then vanish at the danger points. Also, illegal car parking on cycle lanes can create problems.</p> <p>The Cycling Strategy Appendix makes reference to the updated Cycle Mapping Project. This admirable document details a network of designated cycle routes within and between townships. Attached is my response, dated 28th October 2009, the contents of which are relevant to many topics raised in the Draft Local Transport Plan 3 and its associated cycling appendix.</p> <p>To summarise, I support the principles and aspirations detailed within</p>	<p>comment on the document.</p> <p>Regards.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	the draft plan and the cycling appendix, subject to a firm commitment by councillors and council officers to implement the required action.	
Walker – 09/02/11, myjourney email	<p>Has this been thought through and actually driven along? There is a sharp corner in Potton, already traversed with difficulty by lorries (Blackbird St./Wrestlingworth Rd. junction) There is a turn off at Wrestlingworth Cross roads which has seen several accidents due to high speed and 'cutting the corner'. There is a culvert (by The Chequers) which, as far as anyone can remember, has never been tested for weight loading, there is a sharp left turn in Wrestlingworth into Potton Rd.</p> <p>(from High St.) Better by far to make the route via Eyeworth, Dunton and then into Biggleswade to the A1.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
Turner – 09/02/11, myjourney email	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>As a resident of Cockayne Hatley and a member of the Parish Council i am very concerned about the proposal on the Biggleswade and Sandy Transport Plan that HGVs be diverted from the town centres and encouraged to use secondary routes to improve appearances and safety in the urban areas.</p> <p>The HGVs that have their destination within the urban areas will naturally have to be in the urban areas but those passing through to another customer elsewhere will still require the road width and strength to get there safely and without causing damage. The road between Potton and Wrestlingworth is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other, is curbless, unlit, on a steep hill, pocked and broken at the edges from buses and HGVs wandering onto the verge to let others pass, and frequently used by joggers, walkers and horses.</p> <p>I cant think of a less suitable road for HGVs to be diverted to, or one more likely to run up endless repair bills or worse still somebodys death.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Bedford Area Bus	The Bedford Are Bus User's Society (BABUS) would like to submit	Thank you very much for your recent detailed comments



Name	Issue	Response
Users Society 8/02/11	<p>comments on the Draft Local Transport Plan 3. BABUS is a small voluntary group that exists to promote the interest of bus users across Bedford Borough, and that part of Central Bedfordshire east of the M1 Motorway.</p> <p>It is understood that the time horizon for LTP3 extends to 2026. However, BABUS believes that there are pressing issues that justify action by Central Bedfordshire Council now. BABUS have previously made Central Bedfordshire aware of deficiencies in bus service infrastructure and some issues that affect bus operations such as the lack of winter gritting on some routes.</p> <p>BABUS believe that the LTP is artificially constrained by the local authority boundary and that a broader perspective is required including recognition that council tax-payers rely on facilities provided in adjoining local authority areas, especially Bedford Borough. This is a fundamental point given that Central Bedfordshire does not make sense as an economic or geographical entity. The LTP makes it only too clear that Central Bedfordshire relies on facilities provided in other local authority areas for employment and public services. Some detailed comments on the Draft LTP3 are in Appendix 1 (<i>this is available on request</i>).</p> <p>It is not clear to what extent bus and rail operators, town and parish councils, NHS bodies and other agencies have been involved in producing the draft plan. It is regretted that Central Bedfordshire Council has recently withdrawn from the tri-partite liaison meetings with Bedford Borough and BABUS. This is not seen as a policy made in the interests of bus users; presumably this change is in the interest of the Council?</p> <p>BABUS is concerned that there is no proposal to create a Local Area Transport Plan for Ampthill and Flitwick where a number of bus services inter-connect with Thameslink rail services. Detailed comments</p>	<p>concerning the Central Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan 3.</p> <p>The main body of this letter will deal with the matters raised in your letter to us. Attached to this letter is a list of detailed points which respond to each of the matters that you raised in the Appendix to your own letter. We hope that you find this response to be useful.</p> <p>Overview</p> <p>The main LTP3 Strategy Document is, by its nature, a strategic document. The purpose of this document is to outline Central Bedfordshire Council's strategic approach to transport across its authority area. This is then supported by a number of supporting strategies (such as walking and cycling strategies) and Local Area Transport Plans that give further detail on how this strategic approach will be adopted in practice. It is therefore important that the entire LTP3 is considered as a whole.</p> <p>Immediate bus service and stop concerns</p> <p>We have received a copy of your local assessment of bus stop infrastructure, for which we thank you for. This evidence base is currently being considered as part of our bid for the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.</p> <p>Access to Services</p> <p>We note your concerns of Central Bedfordshire Council as being an appropriate administrative body, and particularly the requirement for local residents to travel outside of the</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>concerning these communities are in Appendix 2 (<i>this is available on request</i>). We are also concerned there appears to be no immediate plan for an LAMP for Shefford where a large number of bus services cross and where there should be scope to create a bus interchange.</p> <p>Finally, BABUS wishes to put on record its grave concern about the short time allowed between release of the Draft LTP3 and the deadline allowed to submit comments. This does not reflect well on the Council.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully,</p> <p>Secretary to Bedford Area Bus Users Society</p> <p><i>Two detailed appendices have been included as part of this response. These are available on request by contacting Central Bedfordshire Council Transport Strategy Team on 0300 3006516 or by email on myjourney@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk.</i></p>	<p>authority area to access services. As part of the LTP3 process, this has been identified and assessed as a key issue, and Central Bedfordshire Council is committed to working with statutory bodies, public transport operators, and other local stakeholders for local people to access these services. Examples of interventions could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing services more towards local people, for example care in the community or use of the Internet; • Improving public transport links to key employment sites; • Better information on the modes of transport that can be used to access key facilities. <p>Each individual area of Central Bedfordshire will have its own issues on access to employment, health, and other services. As part of the process of developing Local Area Transport Plans, we will be analysing these issues, and seeking to identify the most appropriate solutions to each area.</p> <p>Extent of Engagement</p> <p>Whilst we understand that the timescales for comments on the main LTP3 Strategy were shorter than desired, there has been extensive consultation on LTP3 in its development. Full details can be found in our consultation report, but to give a summary this has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public exhibitions in locations across Central Bedfordshire • Feedback via Let's Talk Central, email, and other



Name	Issue	Response
		<p>correspondence since May 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct engagement with local communities in the areas covered by Local Area Transport Plans <p>In the future, we will be developing a Local Area Transport Plan for the Ampthill and Flitwick area, and common to the approach that we have taken in developing the existing Local Area Transport Plans we shall be working closely with local Town and Parish Councils and local stakeholders in developing the plans. We look forward to working with you in the development of your area's LATP during 2011/12.</p> <p>Local Area Transport Plans</p> <p>We note your concerns regarding the development of Local Area Transport Plans for Ampthill and Flitwick, and the Shefford Area. Local Area Transport Plans for Ampthill and Flitwick, and Shefford and Surrounds areas are to be developed during 2011/12. Local public transport issues, as well as a number of other issues, will be assessed and considered as part of the Local Area Transport Plan, and we shall be seeking the involvement of local stakeholders in this process. We look forward to engaging with Bedford Area Bus Users Society as part of this process.</p> <p>We thank you very much for your comments on the Draft LTP3 for Central Bedfordshire. If you would like to see a copy of the Final LTP3 document, this will be on our website from 1st April 2011. Please visit www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/myjourney for more information.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
		<p>Two detailed appendices have been included as part of this response. These are available on request by contacting Central Bedfordshire Council Transport Strategy Team on 0300 3006516 or by email on myjourney@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk.</p>
<p>Arlesey Town Council 8/02/11</p>	<p>At the Town Council meeting held on Tuesday 1st February 2011, Arlesey Town Council considered the draft Central Bedfordshire Local Transport (LTP3) and the Arlesey and Stotfold Local Area Transport.</p> <p>One comment was made that the resurfacing work for the 40mph section of Stotfold Road had not been included in the Central Bedfordshire Prioritised Work programme 2011-14. As Stotfold Road is a bus route and a main road into the town perhaps resurfacing work could be considered as a priority as this section of Stotfold Road has bad ruts from the crossing to the A507 roundabout. Otherwise in their deliberations the Town Council considered the LTP3 to be sound.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your recent comments concerning the Central Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan 3, and the Arlesey and Stotfold Local Area Transport Plan.</p> <p>With reference to your comments concerning the resurfacing of Stotfold Road, the Local Area Transport Plans are concerned with delivering local transport improvements through implementing 'integrated transport' schemes, such as cycling and bus stop improvements. Maintenance is considered separately to this process through an annualised programme of works to be delivered across the whole authority area. Stotfold Road, therefore, will be considered as part of this programme of works, and not specifically as part of the Local Area Transport Plan.</p> <p>We thank you very much for your comments on the Draft LTP3 for Central Bedfordshire. If you would like to see a copy of the Final LTP3 document, this will be on our website from 1st April 2011. Please visit www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/myjourney for more information.</p>
<p>Potton town council 08/02/11 myjourney email</p>	<p>My Journey Local Transport Plan 3 draft January 2011</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Comments from Potton Town Council</p> <p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Potton Town Council objects strongly to the proposed Designated Secondary Freight Route through Sandy and Potton along the A603 and B1042 and B1040, passing through the small market town of Potton and the nearby villages.</p> <p>The Town Council has received many complaints about buildings being damaged by large lorries travelling through the town along unsuitable roads which are too narrow for these vehicles. There have been many reports to the Council of incidents caused by lorries having to mount the pavements because the roads are just not wide enough to cope with larger vehicles.</p> <p>There are three mini roundabouts to be negotiated in Potton and residents' cars parked along the road, all of which make increased freight traffic hazardous.</p> <p>The bend in the road from Blackbird Street into Sun Street, Potton is tight and extremely difficult for lorries to negotiate as is the "T" junction from Sun Street into Royston Street. The footway is narrow and properties on both sides of both roads give directly onto the street.</p> <p>The Council receives many complaints about large lorries blocking the very narrow King Street and creating traffic jams, this road, which lorries use to avoid the above junctions, is also completely unsuitable as a freight route.</p> <p>The Council understood that the Freight Policy would strive to direct and divert HGV's away from small towns and villages onto more suitable roads. It was also understood by Potton Town Councillors that the policy would be to direct satellite navigation providers with alternatives routes to the B1040 and B1042.</p> <p>The Council is disappointed that the plan is written without any reference to the small towns and villages along this route, but with a focus wholly upon the towns of Biggleswade and Sandy.</p> <p>Given the above, it is felt that a much more suitable route for traffic</p>	<p>Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	travelling east/west would be to take the A421 from the Cardington junction to the A1 and the A428 from the St Neots turn to either J13 of the M11 or to the A14. This route has recently been upgraded round Great Barford and far better suited to freight traffic.	
Ellis 07/02/11 myjourney email	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I wish to express my great concern over the suggestion that the B1042 through Wrestlingworth be designated a 'secondary freight route'.</p> <p>At the moment, in my opinion, there is already far too much 'heavy' and 'commuter' traffic travelling through this village. Frequently I am woken in the early hours of the morning by the noise of heavy goods vehicles rumbling past my house followed by the almost continual noise of commuter traffic heading, presumably, towards Cambridge or Royston. Over the years the volume of traffic has increased inexorably and the 'quality of life' in this village is being steadily eroded. Parts of the road are sufficiently narrow so that two large vehicles, travelling in opposite directions, can only pass, with great care, if they scrape through the banks and hedges at the sides of the road. Also a fair number of houses, mine included, on this route are very close to the road; on occasions I can feel the vibration of some vehicles travelling just a few yards away from my windows - there are others far worse off than me.</p> <p>Should this proposal be pursued then I feel that you ought to consider constructing a small bypass possibly from the top of the hill between Potton and Wrestlingworth to go around the East side of the village to emerge near the existing crossroad or near to Tallow, or at the bottom of the hill between Potton and Wrestlingworth to go around the West of the village to emerge somewhere near the sewage works. The cost of this to be partially met through a levy on the profits made from developments which would potentially increase the flow of traffic through the village.</p> <p>Whilst writing this, at about 10:30am there has been a steady</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>flow of traffic, lorries vans and cars, passing outside my window. One van, that I have seen, has already used my drive in order to turn round. I was obliged, two years ago, to demolish my 'garden wall' and rebuild it after damage caused by a passing motorist who did not stop, even to apologise. I do not wish an increase in these problems.</p>	
<p>Fairhead 06/02/11 myjourney email</p>	<p>We are writing to express our surprise and extreme dismay at the Borough's intention to make the 1042 through Wrestlingworth a secondary freight route which will sanction even more freight vehicles to pass through the narrow roads with very limited pedestrian walkways, in our village.</p> <p>Our main surprise is that it has not already been approved as a freight route! The increasing numbers and size of the lorries that 'whizz' through our village has increased dramatically since we moved here in 2004. The noise they generate does cause extreme discomfort to the occupants of the properties on the High Street and beyond. If there is a further increase in the number of HGV's through our narrow roads, no doubt this may, eventually cause some damage to the buildings.</p> <p>We are also awoken in the very early hours with the noise of the lorries thundering past our bungalows.</p> <p>The High Street has very recently been rendered again which won't last very long with the amount of traffic it has to suffer. We often take our life in our hands when we venture out to walk along the High Street due to the lack of pavements in several places along the road.</p> <p>If your intention is to minimise the impact on local communities then we have to say your intentions are extremely misguided. With regard to the impact on towns such as Biggleswade and Sandy, we believe that the impact on such towns cannot be avoided because of the number of businesses and supermarkets that rely on heavy vehicles delivering goods and produce. Obviously there are also far more cars etc in the towns because of the number of residents in those areas. How the impact on the towns and the increased congestion caused by any traffic can be avoided is a matter you need to return to the drawing board to</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>work out. Sadly we don't even have a shop in Wrestlingworth which would need vans and lorries to come through the village to deliver goods.</p> <p>It is our view that freight vehicle drivers already feel it is acceptable for them to drive through our village as a convenient cut through from Cambridge to Bedford and visa versa. If you do make the 1042 an official secondary freight route, we hate to think what the impact would be in Wrestlingworth</p>	<p>please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Nurse, 06/02/11 myjourney email	<p>I wish to put my observations on record regarding the proposals as laid out in the above document on Page 31 for a Secondary Freight Route through the village of Wrestlingworth on the B1042.</p> <p>1. You state that the Secondary Freight Route is for Access and Deliveries, Does this mean that all other HGV traffic will be excluded ? I think that this would be very difficult to enforce.</p> <p>2. There appears to be no restriction on this route, and the maximum weight HGVs regularly use this it. There is an obvious difficulty for 40' trailers at the junction of Royston Street and Sun Street in Potton (Lat 52.126787, Long -0.214977) where this length of vehicle needs the whole width of the road in either direction to negotiate this bend.</p> <p>3. In Wrestlingworth there is a network of Victorian tunnels which carry rain water towards Home Farm on the High Street (Lat 52.107344, Long -0.163796) from the junction of Potton Road and High Street (Lat 52.111441, Long-0.164738). These tunnels are being destroyed by the heavy traffic and are in a perilous state of disrepair. I think the a restriction of 7.5 tons has been suggested to alleviate this particular problem but not implemented.</p> <p>4. On a personal note, I live at 32, High Street (Lat 52.109851, Long -0.164847). The house was built in 1720 and I have lived here since 1988. The increasing heavy traffic along this part of the High Street is destroying the structural fabric of the house, with many cracks appearing in the walls. Do I have any recourse against the authorities for this</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>damage ?</p> <p>5. It appears to me that the B1042 is being used by HGVs as a East/West route to and from the East Coast Ports to the A1/M1.</p> <p>Surely this is what the A14, A428 have been designed for. I would like to see these routes enforced.</p> <p>I hope the above has been constructive and helpful in assisting you in making your planning decisions</p>	<p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Williams, 05/02/11 myjourney email	<p>We write to object to the proposed Designated Freight Route through Sandy and Pottton along the A603 and B1042.</p> <p>This section of the LTP is written without any reference to the villages along this route, but with a focus wholly upon the towns of Biggleswade and Sandy. Taking the villages into consideration our objections are:</p> <p>The A603 from the A421 junction at Cardington has a narrow winding stretch between Willington, through Moggerhanger to the A1. There have been numerous serious accidents involving lorries along this road, some of which have been fatal. Increasing the volume of freight traffic along this route would increase the risk of serious accidents.</p> <p>20 mph traffic calming through Sandy town centre, parked cars and general town traffic makes it an unsuitable route for freight transport.</p> <p>The road up to Pottton from Deepdale is narrow and steep, with a blind corner just east of the former Locomotive public house.</p> <p>Once in Pottton there are three mini roundabouts to be negotiated and residents' cars parked along the road, all of which make increased freight traffic hazardous.</p> <p>The T junction between Blackbird Street and Royston Street, Pottton is tight and extremely difficult for lorries to negotiate. The footway is narrow and properties on both sides of the road give</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Pottton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>directly onto the street.</p> <p>In Wrestlingworth the T junction at Potton Road and the High Street is blind for pedestrians crossing here. This stretch of the High Street does not have a footway on the sighted side of the road and using that side would involve crossing twice.</p> <p>The stretch of Wrestlingworth High Street between Potton Road and Church Lane East has two culverts carrying the brook, a tributary of the River Cam. Both culverts are thought to be structurally weak as they are in a similar condition to the one which has just been replaced along the stretch of the High Street leading to Cockayne Hatley. They would be further weakened by more heavy traffic.</p> <p>The junction of Church Lane east and the High Street is a narrow lane without a footway. This is used by parents taking their children to and from the village school and negotiating the High Street end of this lane is already hazardous.</p> <p>At the edge of the village on the crossroads of the B1042, Tadlow/Guilden Morden/Eyeworth is a dangerous junction where there have been numerous accidents, both minor and serious. There has been a lobby for a roundabout here for many years. The road going east – west across the top of the village onto the B1042 is unrestricted and very fast. Traffic turning left towards Cambridge and right from the Cambridge/Tadlow direction both cause a hazard, which would be exacerbated by an increase in freight traffic.</p> <p>The B1042 was downgraded from the A603 some years ago when traffic volume was much lighter than now; we believe this downgrading should be respected.</p> <p>Given the above, we feel that a much more suitable route for traffic travelling east/west would be to take the A421 from the Cardington junction to the A1 and the A428 from the St Neots turn to either J13 of the M11 or to the A14. This route has recently been upgraded round Great Barford and far better suited to freight traffic.</p>	<p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
Jarvis 04/02/11 myjourney email	Please would you inform me what is meant by A secondary freight route, as in the draft Transport plan.	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
Hall 03/02/11 myjourney email	<p>As I understand it, part of the national strategy for transport is to divert heavy goods vehicles away from small villages and narrow roads. Predominantly the reasons are to protect the environment and for safety reasons, hence the construction of by-passes.</p> <p>Your proposal to classify B1042 as a secondary freight route would actually encourage HGVs to use unsuitable roads through market towns and quiet villages with narrow streets.</p> <p>In Potton, in particular, lorries already have to navigate tight bends in narrow streets and they frequently run across the narrow pavements to do so, endangering the lives of pedestrians as well as breaking the kerbs. In some parts of the B1042 route the road is so narrow that it is impossible a large lorry and a car to pass side by side. When two lorries try to pass they can only do so by mounting the pavements. The limited number of residential parking bays would have to become lorry passing places, so where would local people be able to park?</p> <p>In many of these villages including Wrestlingworth and Potton, some of the older - and historically important - houses and cottages open directly onto the narrow pavement walkway. The vibration caused by these vehicles is known to have a detrimental effect on the structure of such buildings and will become more pronounced if traffic volume increases. Lorries will continue to grow in size for economic reasons so the issue will become worse.</p> <p>Apart from the safety of pedestrians, another health issue is the pollution that these vehicles bring to the atmosphere. And as lorries become jammed in such places where they cannot easily pass on narrow streets, local traffic come to a standstill.</p> <p>One would have hoped that the local authority would identify the needs of local people as their primary concern and try to limit, if not ban altogether, HGVs from using narrow streets in small villages as a through route. Your proposal is surely a retrograde step.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
Barfoot, 03/02/11 myjourney email	<p>Dear sir or madam</p> <p>As I understand it, part of the national strategy for transport is to divert heavy goods vehicles away from small villages and narrow roads. Predominantly the reasons are to protect the environment and for safety reasons, hence the construction of by-passes.</p> <p>Your proposal to classify B1042 as a secondary freight route would actually encourage HGVs to use unsuitable roads through market towns and quiet villages with narrow streets.</p> <p>In Pottton, in particular, lorries already have to navigate tight bends in narrow streets and they frequently run across the narrow pavements to do so, endangering the lives of pedestrians as well as breaking the kerbs. In some parts of the B1042 route the road is so narrow that it is impossible a large lorry and a car to pass side by side. When two lorries try to pass they can only do so by mounting the pavements. The limited number of residential parking bays would have to become lorry passing places, so where would local people be able to park?</p> <p>In many of these villages including Wrestlingworth and Pottton, some of the older - and historically important - houses and cottages open directly onto the narrow pavement walkway. The vibration caused by these vehicles is known to have a detrimental effect on the structure of such buildings and will become more pronounced if traffic volume increases. Lorries will continue to grow in size for economic reasons so the issue will become worse.</p> <p>Apart from the safety of pedestrians, another health issue is the pollution that these vehicles bring to the atmosphere. And as lorries become jammed in such places where they cannot easily pass on narrow streets, local traffic come to a standstill.</p> <p>One would have hoped that the local authority would identify the needs of local people as their primary concern and try to limit, if not ban altogether, HGVs from using narrow streets in small villages as a through route. Your proposal is surely a retrograde step.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Pottton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
Dolwin, 03/02/11 myjourney email	<p>It is difficult to give an opinion on on this designation without knowing what changes, if any, it will entail.</p> <p>Will it mean more traffic through the village which already suffers through H.G.V.s?</p> <p>Will it mean a change in road markings and sign posts?</p> <p>If the answer is 'Yes', then the revised designation will have an enormously deleterious affect on Wrestlingworth.</p> <p>Please could there be clarification of the changes resulting from making the B1042 a Secondary Freight</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Pearson, 02/02/10 myjourney email	have been advised by our Parish Council that it is the intention of Central Bedfordshire to make the B1042 a Secondary Freight Route in	Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>future transport plans for the area.</p> <p>I currently live in the village of Wrestlingworth in the High Street in which the B1042 passes through and frankly this proposal is absolutely ludicrous. We already receive a large amount of through traffic including freight and my initial reaction is structural damage to properties in the High Street and the risk to pedestrians. This is also likely to have a major impact on house prices and the ability to be able to sell one's property as I will be trying to do in the next few years. After all, who would want to purchase a property against this proposal. It is also a fact that freight traffic travels through the night and this is likely to affect sleep patterns and lead to a gradual deterioration of one's health.</p> <p>The other issue is speeding. There is at present very little deterrent and I have also witnessed lorries travelling down the High Street from the Cambridge direction at circa 40 - 50 mph and all this in a 30mph zone. I have had countless discussions with the local police about this and it is about time consideration was given to a permanent speed camera.</p> <p>In conclusion, rather than add to the problem, we should be looking to divert traffic away from the village not through it. We already have the A1 and A428, which can handle this type of traffic, so why are we not making more use of this? Villages by their very nature are not suitable for volume traffic as you only have to look at the situation in Pottun our next village.</p> <p>I think it right that this planning consideration be revisited as this will have a devastating affect on this village and the local area in general.</p>	<p>Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Pottun and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Ram, 02/02/10, myjourney email	On the Central Bedfordshire web site there is a link to a local transport plan (Appendix K - Biggleswade and Sandy local transport plan page 31 section 5.6) which shows that the intention is to make the B1040 and B1042 <u>secondary freight routes</u> and will therefore send freight lorries	Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>through the town of Potton and the village of Wrestlingworth and that comments are invited about this proposal.</p> <p>The proposal states: 'This network seeks to focus freight trips on specific routes through the authority so as to minimise the impact on local communities and town centres.' and 'There are concerns as to the prevalence of HGV vehicles within both town centres and the detrimental impact these movements have on the attractiveness of the town centres for visitors as well as safety concerns they present. Access issues and restrictions are required to be addressed to help reduce the volume and impact of such flows.'</p> <p>As residents of Wrestlingworth who use these routes regularly, we have the following comments:</p> <p>The proposal to designate the B1040 and B1042 as secondary freight routes directly contradicts the statements quoted above.</p> <p>These routes are totally unsuitable for regular freight traffic through Potton and Wrestlingworth. There are sharp bends and narrow streets through Potton on both routes - some large lorries using the routes already cause traffic holds-ups and potential danger to pedestrians, as well as being detrimental to the attractiveness of the town centre, and these problems would increase substantially. King Street in particular is extremely narrow and already deliveries to the Co-op and Tesco cause difficulties.</p> <p>In Wrestlingworth, on the B1042, there is a T-junction, narrow lanes and lack of pavement in several places making it unsuitable for regular use by HGVs. Wrestlingworth is an attractive and relatively peaceful village - as everywhere, traffic (including lorries) has increased in recent years and we wish to see this controlled, not increased.</p> <p>We cannot believe that those making this proposal have actually driven along these routes to assess their suitability. We suspect planners have just looked at maps.</p> <p>We oppose this proposal strongly.</p>	<p>within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
<p>Carlile, 02/02/11, myjourney email</p>	<p>Dear Sir/ Madam</p> <p>As a resident of Wrestlingworth I have very grave concerns about the proposal to make the B1042 a secondary freight route. The road is already too dangerous and one of the local residents was knocked down on the Potton Road stretch only a few months ago.</p> <p>I have three young children to walk to the village school and have to cross the B1042 with them a minimum of 4 times every school day and with the volume and speed of traffic as it is at the moment I fear for their safety every time we cross. The thought that this could be made even worse makes me feel quite ill as we have already had two near misses. I was of the understanding there was an obligation to ensure children a safe route to school, not only do we not have that at the moment but by increasing the volume of traffic along the B1042 that is going to be made so much worse and so much more dangerous.</p> <p>I would be very happy for someone to contact me regarding this matter.</p> <p>Thank you for your time</p> <p>Marion Carlile</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
<p>Woburn Sands and District</p>	<p>Our comments are both General and Specific to parts of the Draft LPT3 main report, due to lack of provision of the appendices.</p>	<p>No major changes to LTP3 required. Response to be sent out shortly.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
Society 01/02/11	<p>General</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are extremely concerned about the consultation process on what is an important authority wide strategy document. This was supposed to be published for consultation on the 22nd December, it was not. It was published on the CBC web site on the 6th January, only a limited number of local authorities were advised of this on the 6th. Parish Councils were not advised until the 12th. The document(s) were not sent to libraries until the 12th, arriving on the 17th January, and we are advised did not contain the referenced and underpinning appendices. . Due to the size of the main report and appendices, consideration on line, or printing off was not possible. This society requested a hard copy of the documents by e-mail on the 6th January to CBC Customer Services. It should be noted that the appendices contain most of the detail, supporting strategies, and assessments. A copy of the main report only was provided after several e-mails, arriving on the 18th January. This left insufficient time to request and consider the appendices, even if hard copies had been provided on request, before the deadline of the 11th February. 2. We deplore that fact that the consultation on this document appears to have focussed on stakeholders and agencies, and a few targetted councils in growth areas. This is an authority wide strategy and therefore consultation should have been authority wide. An officer comment "The approach we took was to try and use audiences appropriately, not overburdening bodies with consultation where they can more usefully be consulted at another time" we found patronising in the extreme and is in effect denying local communities, outside the targeted areas, any input into the final draft LTP3. This strategy is the 	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>overarching framework from which LATPs will be developed. Therefore all local communities, parish and town councils, should have been involved and consulted, not just those in the growth areas whose LATPs form part of LTP3. .</p> <p>3. Whilst we can not form a robust view of the main report without the appendices, in the main we support a substantial part of this document with the exception of some specifics identified below.</p> <p>Specific Comment</p> <p>1. Milton Keynes Growth Figures (p21 lower box) – as CBC is very well aware, the numbers for homes and jobs are based on the RSS targets, and are being reviewed. The fact that the RSS are to be abolished is, following judgement, still a material consideration in planning terms The draft core strategy has revised the figure down to more realistic and achievable totals, i.e. 28,000 homes by 2026 and with an aspiration of 1.5 jobs per home, 42,000 jobs by 2026. Therefore the figures in the LTP need to reflect the fact that the MK totals are being reviewed. i.e. <i>42,000 (by 2031)homes under review and 49,000(by 2031) jobs, under review</i>. Additionally the figures for Bedford, need to show the target year as set out in Hertfordshire and London.</p> <p>2. Engagement with the wider sector and local community (p29), requires clarifying, as with the exception of being advised at the June conference and some information gathering on the web site, most of the local communities in CBC have not been engaged with the production of LTP 3. See General Comments above. As stated Local communities should have been involved and consulted on the production of a strategic plan, that provides the framework from which LATPs will be developed.</p> <p>3. The Freight Industry in Central Bedfordshire (P55) – we are</p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>becoming increasingly concerned in respect of what appears to be an inaccurate view of the importance of storage and logistics in providing local employment in the northern area of CBC. For the figures shown in terms of employment in this area to be of any economic use, they need to show clearly the number of CBC resident employees. It is not enough to just count jobs particularly in this sector, after construction, as employment in this sector is low numbers for size of footprint, low tech, and low paid. Additionally, this section is in direct opposition to P76 where it states <i>"encouraging the transportation of a greater proportion of freight by modes other than road based vehicles is a key objective of this strategy"</i>. Our concerns about this seeming tunnel vision of CBC in respect of logistics and storage, whilst recognising the market demand is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the complete antithesis to CBC espoused intention of being an "economic powerhouse" with an aspiration of a sustainable high tech, high skill job economy. • Sustainability. Very few of the jobs generated in this sector are filled by local residents, as they are too low paid therefore workers are bussed in (local non car transport being limited if at all) and local residents commute out to London, Bedford and MK to higher paid jobs. • The effect on climate change, air quality, and congestion of focusing such employment on the A421 and its junctions with both the M1 and A1 – where there is little if any alternative to road transportation. Unlike cars, we have seen little evidence of the truck manufacturing industry, other than "boat tails" of developing low emission lorries • The improvements to the A421 and Junction 13 only have the capacity to meet what was then the known development in CBC. <p>Surely this must be recognised as a high risk strategy long term,</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>when oil supplies are diminishing and prices inevitably rise.</p> <p>4. Connectivity (P64-5) there is no mention in this section of rail services, both mainline and the proposed EW rail link. Though this latter brings very little connectivity to the Marston Vale, as every option put forward in the options report included, due to capacity issues, a reduction of the hourly service to two hourly. However the incorporation of how to make best use of existing rail services should have appeared in this section.</p> <p>5. Car Parking (p75) we were unable to consider this strategy as it was in a non provided appendix. However we have concerns in respect of the proposals in the main report for demand management – i.e. restrictions and enforcement. The displacement activity in respect of this approach can be damaging, unless viable alternatives to car use in terms of availability, regularity, and cost are in place – the park and ride schemes in Oxford as an example.</p> <p>6. Transporting Freight by Non-Road Modes (P76) and Freight Action Areas (P77) – this key objective we would support particularly in respect of rail use and interchange hubs, but find that this completely opposes the sections on the Freight Industry P55. If this a key objective of this strategy, then why does CBC continue to see the length of the Marston Vale as sites for storage, distribution and transport, where there are no, nor are likely to be, other modes of transport than road.</p> <p>7. Rail Freight Routes (P77) – we would fully support that the EW rail link could provide a rail alternative, however its inclusion in this LPT3 is more than somewhat premature. We can not see that, with the capacity problems of the Marston Vale Line, or the problems in terms of the proposed routes between MK and Cambridge, this can be anything more than an aspiration in the long term future. Therefore this paragraph should clearly identify</p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>this as a long term aspiration</p> <p>8. East–West Rail Link - (P84) as stated the Central Section is problematic due to past planning decisions by Local Authorities. We note the inclusion of one of the options to provide a chord between the Marston Vale Line and the Midland Mainline. However once again we would remind CBC that all the options for the Central Section included a reduction of the stopping service in Marston Vale from hourly to two hourly for reasons of capacity. One of the reasons why we are totally opposed to both the emphasis on storage and logistics in the Marston Vale, and re-industrialisation of the rejuvenating Vale – whether by Covanta or by similar.</p> <p>9. Dualing the A421 west of Junction 13 – we have concerns that we can find no evidence of this in the document provided.</p> <p>10. Quite Lanes -The Society also deplores the fact that following Parish Councils and other organisations interest and involvement in a Quiet Lanes policy in CBC North (a predominantly rural area), this has been unilaterally discounted and excluded from LTP3 as of insufficient concern/importance".</p> <p>In summary there is a lot in this document that the Society supports, however we have concerns both in terms of the inclusivity and consultation aspects of LTP3, and specific points within the document, as identified above.</p>	
01/02/11, barton le clay parish council	<p>Barton-le-Clay Parish Council would like to express the following comments on the LTP3.</p> <p>1) A Master Plan, such as those generated for the larger towns, should be devised for Barton-le-Clay and similar rural communities.</p> <p>2) Specific areas that should be concentrated on in Barton-le-Clay</p>	<p>Firstly thank you for taking the time to review and respond the LTP, we greatly appreciate your local knowledge and input. The information you provided will be extremely useful in developing the Local Area Transport Plan for the South Bedfordshire Rural area of which Barton-Le-Clay</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete cycle network <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient parking facilities within the village centre out outside of lower school (Ramsey Road) <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrianisation <input type="checkbox"/> Bus stop enhancements – real time information <input type="checkbox"/> 20mph zones <input type="checkbox"/> Lorry bans/restrictions <input type="checkbox"/> Accessibility to train station by bus <input type="checkbox"/> Accessibility to Hitchin by bus <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian crossing in Luton Road to Co-op <p>3) Additionally the Parish Council supports the extension of the public footway from Barton-le-Clay to Sharpenhoe and Harlington.</p>	<p>will be included. We will begin development on this towards the end of this year and into next year and we will be back in touch with you so that you can input into the development of your local plan in more detail at that time. We very much look forward to working with you in the future Kind regards The Transport Strategy team</p>
Curry 01/02/11. myjourney email	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I am writing to you concerning the proposal to route freight through Wrestlingworth Village which according to the Biggleswade and Sandy LTP "seeks to focus freight trips on specific routes through the authority so as to minimise the impact on local communities and town centres".</p> <p>I am the headteacher of Wrestlingworth VC Lower School and Dunton VC Lower School and I live in Potton so I daily use this road system.</p> <p>Below are the reasons why using Wrestlingworth Village as a preferred route for freight would not be a good idea and would have a huge impact on the local community.</p> <p>1. Most of the roads through the village do not have footpaths</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Children from the village walking to school have to walk in the gutter.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Cars that are parked at the sides of the High Street mean that the</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>children have to walk into the road to pass them.</p> <p>Crossing the Potton Road is very dangerous. The angle of the road prevents you from clearly seeing oncoming traffic.</p> <p>2. The roads approaching Wrestlingworth are "lanes" too narrow and with incomplete centre white lines and no kerbs.</p> <p>It is impossible for two large lorries (for example the quarry lorries that already use the roads) to pass each other without going onto the verge and quite difficult for one lorry and one car.</p> <p>Frequently lorries use the centre of the road because the edges of the roads are uneven necessitating evasive action if they are coming towards you. This includes the double decker buses taking the older children to school.</p> <p>There is a lot of slow farm traffic in the area.</p> <p>3. The roads approaching Wrestlingworth from Potton are both steep hills.</p> <p>In the winter snow and ice lorries cannot get up the hills. I have encountered them this year sliding down and sideways into oncoming traffic.</p> <p>4. When lorries miss the turning to Potton and go further along the village High Street towards Cockayne Hatley there is no-where for them to turn round.</p> <p>5. The impact on the "village" life. and the fact that many of the houses are right on the roadway.</p>	<p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Anderson 31/01/11, myjourney email	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Has there been any consideration to Wrestlingworth or Potton when planning a secondary freight route on B1042, I have lived on the B1042 for the past 22 years & continue to see more HGV's coming through the village, making it more dangerous to walk, cycle & horse ride, it is after all a VILLAGE, I have to walk 500 meters on the road before I reach a</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>footpath, so am always having to get up on to the verge when these HGV's come through. These heavy vehicles then go onto Potton where the road narrows causing the pavement on the corner of Royston Street to be damaged, the HGV's have to swing out in to the middle of the road & still go over the corner of the pavement. I travel this route everyday & most day's get held up with HGV's trying to get round this junction.</p> <p>Please, please do not send more HGV's through Wrestlingworth.</p>	<p>follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Drew – 31/01/10, myjourney email	<p>Dear Sir or Madam</p> <p>On the Central Bedfordshire web site there is a link to a local transport plan which states that the intention is to make the B1042 a <u>secondary freight route</u> and will therefore send freight lorries through the village of Wrestlingworth and that comments are invited about this proposal.</p> <p>As Rector of Wrestlingworth I am emailing you to say that it would be</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>detrimental to the village to have lorries using its lanes. The reasons for this are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lanes into and out of, and within the village community are country lanes and were never constructed to be capable of HGV's and such like. 2. The road surface would be damaged resulting in more cost to the LA in repairs. 3. The narrowness of the lanes means that it will create dangerous conditions if HGVs were to use them. 4. There is a powerful need to preserve Wrestlingworth as a village of beauty, peace and tranquility-the noise and intrusion HGVs would ruin the essential nature of the village community. 5. With lengths of road without a pavement there would be serious and dangerous hazards for residents using the lanes as pedestrians. 6. Where there are pavements they are very narrow and this too would create dangerous situations for pedestrians. <p>I hope you will reconsider the proposals in the light if these comments and no doubt the many others you will receive objecting to the use of our country lanes of Wrestlingworth for HGVs and similar vehicles.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	<p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Adkins 31/01/11 – myjourney email	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I am very concerned with the idea to promote the B1042 as a secondary freight route as this may lead to the increase in lorries driving through our village – Wrestlingworth.</p> <p>Wrestlingworth is a small village. There is a tight and difficult junction in the village and a very dangerous and partly blind turn onto the main road leading into the village</p> <p>Increased traffic will inevitably lead to more accidents and quite possibly</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>pedestrian fatalities in the village as the footpaths are inadequate</p> <p>Simon Adkins FCA</p> <p>Water End Cottage</p> <p>Wrestlingworth</p> <p>Beds</p> <p>SG19 2HA</p>	<p>Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
<p>Mrs Dear 28/01/11 – myjourney email</p>	<p>I have taken the time to read your local transport plan and am appalled to see that it is intended that the B1042 is to be used as a secondary freight route. This route goes through Wrestlingworth, a very small village which has a 30mph speed limit, narrow roads and a junior school. A far better alternative route connecting Cambridge with Bedford is surely the A428 which is a dual carriageway for the majority of this route.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040</p>

Name	Issue	Response
		<p>and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Resident Wrestlingworth – 28/01/11 my journey	<p>Dear sir/Madam,I live in Wrestlingworth and am horrified that you propose to allow huge great lorries etc through our narrow village roads.NO.NO.NO. It is obvious that you have NEVER DRIVEN THROUGH HERE.</p> <p>I feel a campaign being organised.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the draft Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire and the Local Area Transport Plan for Sandy and Biggleswade. We fully appreciate your concerns with regards to freight traffic within your local area and we should like to advise as follows.</p> <p>Firstly the map demonstrating the 'Designated Road Freight Network' (page 72 of the draft Local Transport Plan) displays the existing freight network and as a designation has been in place for some time. The B1040 and the B1042 was designated as a secondary freight route so as to allow delivery vehicles access to the rural</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		<p>areas within the boundary to the east of the A1.</p> <p>We are very mindful of the potential negative impacts that freight can have on local communities and the difficulties large vehicles face when accessing small more local roads, particularly those in the more rural areas such as Potton and Wrestlingworth and as such there are no plans to implement any measures that would attract any additional unnecessary through trips onto the route.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
Long, 27/01/11	<p>The BCA welcome the opportunity to respond to the draft LTP 3. We have several <i>serious</i> reservations about the document & appendices in their present form.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It should be more accountable to local people; 2. The local authority should have contacted, fully consulted and requested input from rail (& bus) operators, as well as from Network Rail; 3. Wider consultation should have taken place with more generous timescales for both measured input & responses; this should have included Town & Parish Councils, amongst others; 4. There is little reference to "joint working" & shared senior management teams (for example, across more than one council) – partnership with public transport operators; with adjoining local authorities; or following Eric Pickles/DCLG recent exhortations to adopt this innovative approach in the interests of 	<p>Further to my previous email, and recent emails that you have sent, we have considered the comments that you have provided to us on the Local Transport Plan 3. We thank you for these comments, and our response is as follows:</p> <p>Amphill and Flitwick Local Area Transport Plan (LATP)</p> <p>As part of LTP3, we will be developing, and ultimately delivering a series of LATPs covering all areas of Central Bedfordshire. Due to the extensive amount of background work required to develop both the LATPs and the LTP Strategies, we were advised by members at an early stage to develop LATPs for the 4 key growth areas in the authority of Arlesey & Stotfold, Biggleswade & Sandy,</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>efficiency, economy, more flexible & responsive services. Possible models for this may be the South East Midlands LEP or the Beds Highways/Amey arrangements - are contracts to be put out to tender for outsourcing with relevant external consultants, perhaps even for the transport planning/strategy responsibilities of the authority, themselves?;</p> <p>5. Despite being formed in April 2009, it has taken nearly two years for Central Beds to produce the draft LTP, with a very limited time-period to respond;</p> <p>6. Linkage of transport policy to the changing public service landscape, to proposals for sustainable growth & economic development. The draft LTP appears to lack a holistic approach to land use planning/development control & transport planning in the unitary. The draft represents "more of the same" and has demonstrated little evidence of leadership, real change, a willingness to do things differently, or a response to meeting the aspirations and needs of the community. Where is the transformation that the creation of the unitary offered & was promised?</p> <p>7. Lack of strong commercial & entrepreneurial culture as demonstrated by the deficient content of the LTP. Failure to grasp good corporate governance practice.</p> <p>8. In comparison to other (draft) English LTP 3s, Central Beds offering is weak, partial, poorly presented and lacking in substance.</p> <p>9. The BCA's letter "Rail Issues in Central Bedfordshire" dated 13 August 2009 has been ignored. There is no mention of "user groups" on page 27.</p> <p>10. Whilst the LTP may attempt to set out Central Bedfordshire Council's policies, strategies and the way it will prioritise improvements over the coming years to address the transport related challenges and issues across the unitary, it does not deal adequately with public transport or with Ampthill/Flitwick (because no Local Area Transport Plan has been included for these towns).</p> <p>11. The draft LTP fails to take account of the new Coalition</p>	<p>Dunstable & Houghton Regis, and Leighton-Linslade. Whilst there are transport and growth issues across the authority area, these are particularly acute within these areas, hence why LATPs have been developed for these areas as the first tranche.</p> <p>The Ampthill and Flitwick Local Area Transport Plan will be developed during the next tranche of LATPs in the next financial year (2011/12), along with LATPs for Marston Vale, Shefford, and the South Bedfordshire Rural Area. As an interested party in the Ampthill and Flitwick area you shall be consulted on the development of the Ampthill and Flitwick LATP.</p> <p>You should also note that just because other areas have had LATPs developed first does not mean that the Flitwick area will not receive LTP funds during next financial year. In fact, Central Beds has put aside £200,000 towards the development of junction improvements at Millbrook and Steppingley as part of the Centre Parcs development.</p> <p>Inclusion of rail schemes</p> <p>We accept that major rail schemes have not been included as part of the draft LTP3 Strategy. We will be making changes to this draft to include further text on the Thameslink Programme, The Wixams Station, and the extension of the Marston Vale Line rail service. Attached is the text that we wish to include which states our policy position on these matters, and we would appreciate any comments that you would like to make as a Transport Planner on this text. These will go in the Major Schemes section of the LTP.</p> <p>Public Consultation</p> <p>We have carried out extensive consultation in the development of LTP3 with a variety of stakeholders, so we</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Government's emerging policies and the recent Spending Review, and as a plan seems to have ignored the current financial climate & its on-going ramifications.</p> <p>12. The draft LTP does not challenge orthodoxy – rising fuel prices/suppressed road traffic demand; over-budget road & guided-busway schemes costing substantially more and taking much longer to deliver; wider transport objectives largely ignored; realistic cost & time estimates proving to be unattainable; carbon reduction strategies ignored; no lift-sharing pilot scheme or similar more sustainable initiative.</p> <p>13. Central Bedfordshire is nebulous socio-economically and geographically without a predominant major centre or county town. For employment and retailing it relies heavily on Bedford, Luton, Milton Keynes & Cambridge (amongst other centres) so that out-commuting is a feature. This spatial hierarchy is unlikely to change, suggesting Central Bedfordshire needs to co-operate very closely with its neighbouring adjacent local authorities and beyond its boundaries sub-regionally.</p> <p>14. Little is said in the draft about risk, compliance and reporting (on delivery).</p> <p>More serious is the lack of any meaningful consultation with stakeholders, or the rail industry itself, since the unitary was originally set up in April 2009. The local authority has also failed to attend any of the forums/meetings which the rail industry and Passenger Focus have organised - and to which their representatives were invited. Other local authorities have been more diligent in ensuring representatives attended these events – both at officer & elected member level.</p> <p>Most other local authorities had their new draft LTPs circulating in late summer/early autumn last year. Not so with Central Beds. It has taken until January 2011 & responses then have to be back early February! Barely four weeks to respond! This guillotine is unacceptable, undemocratic and very unprofessional! It barely scrapes the surface of</p>	<p>would contend the point that there has been inadequate consultation in the development of LTP3. In your specific case we have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had a presentation at a meeting of the Bedfordshire Rural Transport Forum on LTP 3, where we set out the direction that LTP3 was taking and inviting comments on local transport matters • Invited to submit comments on LTP3 matters through the launch of the myjourney website and Let's Talk Central • Held the LTP3 Stakeholder Conference in September 2010, where you attended and provided comments both during and after the event • Previous correspondence on LTP3 and other local transport issues <p>Through these means, we consider that you have had adequate opportunities with which to inform the development of LTP3</p> <p>With regards to requesting the input of the bus and rail operators, and Network Rail, we have contacted all bus and rail operators operating in Central Bedfordshire to request their input and thoughts on the LTP, and have even held meetings with some. We have also asked for the input of organisations such as the Association of Community Rail Partnerships, and all members of the Marston Vale Community Rail Partnership Steering Group.</p> <p>We have also consulted with neighbouring authorities on the LTP (and have responded to their consultations), and</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>public consultation and is far removed from the spirit of due diligence.</p> <p>The BCA understand that Patrick O'Sullivan (Jacobs Consultancy/HCA) will respond in respect of the East-West Rail Link (EWRL) [pages 77 & 84-85], indicating how this rail scheme should be included in the LTP 3 and the central route section east of Bedford towards the ECML moved forward.</p> <p>We believe that Central Beds should show support in their LTP for Midland Main Line (MML) electrification & for EWRL, and to lobby (in conjunction with other local authorities) for delivery of these vital rail schemes. There is no mention in the LTP of working with its rail partners, but the draft document is fulsome in respect of co-operation with the Highways Agency - M1 hard shoulder running/widening, A5/M1 link road, Junction 13 remodelling, other trunk road schemes, etc.</p> <p>The same could also be said about the similar lack of commitment to bus and rail operators. No mention either of the provision of safe, integrated & efficient rail services that facilitate easy interchange with bus services & other modes of transport and that meet the travel needs of (Central Beds) public transport users!</p> <p>Following the cancellation (of the former Mid Beds Station/Car Parking meetings - last one, 3rd March 2009), there is no hint either in the draft LTP about the improvement of local rail services (for example, MVL/Milton Keynes extension, etc.) and of railway stations/station car parking, and to make these train services and their stations accessible for all customers. Over the period of the Local Transport Plan Central Bedfordshire's objective should be to see improvements to the rail infrastructure. For example, is it working in partnership with Network Rail and the TOCs to improve access to rail stations?</p> <p>Just a few of the serious failings in the Central Beds draft LTP.</p>	<p>we also routinely work with neighbouring authorities on highways and public transport matters.</p> <p>Linkage of transport to planning and other public sector work</p> <p>We do not believe that LTP3 shows a lack of integration between planning, transport planning, and other areas of public sector work. On the contrary, we believe that many areas of LTP3 show strong links between transport and these areas. In particular we would like to draw your attention to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wider issues and opportunities section of LTP3, which shows how issues such as planning, health, economic growth, climate change, and quality of life relate to transport (and vice versa). This section also highlights the approaches Central Bedfordshire will be taking to these issues. • The strategic approach section of LTP3, which highlights a number of factors that have shaped the development of LTP3, and our approaches to these issues • The objectives and priorities section of LTP3, which places a particular emphasis on achieving the priorities of the Sustainable Communities Strategy • The areas of intervention section, of which Land Use Planning plays a key role • The Local Area Transport Plans, where due to planning considerations we focussed the first 4 in identified growth areas, and which highlight a number of schemes that are being delivered by Section 106 contributions



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Examination of adjoining local authority draft LTP 3s (and those further afield) would have illustrated how it was possible to go about the whole exercise with due diligence!</p> <p>The BCA wish to see the following included in the LTP 3 in respect of RAIL TRAVEL</p> <p>To encourage the use of rail as an attractive and viable travel choice, the Council, in partnership with Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies, will seek :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provision of safe, integrated and efficient rail services that facilitate easy interchange with bus services and other modes of transport and that meet the travel needs of rail customers. 2. The improvement of local and inter-city trains (rolling stock) and of stations in Central Beds to make these accessible (as defined in the DDA) for all customers. "Access for All" initiative. The Council should work with the Train Operating Companies to deliver improvements to access and facilities at all railway stations within the unitary authority. 3. The adoption of <i>Station Travel Plans</i> following that at Leighton Buzzard (Leighton Buzzard was selected as one of 31 pilot Station Travel Plan schemes in 2008). The BCA strongly suggest that Flitwick should be the next <i>Station Travel Plan</i> to be produced by the local authority [pages 30-31 & 51]. 4. Appropriate marketing of rail services in conjunction with other initiatives such as ticketing and customer information improvements. 5. To help rail services perform a key role in supporting & enhancing the economic vitality of Central Beds. <p>The Council should also :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6 Support the delivery of the Thameslink Programme in conjunction with the rail industry, following Philip Hammond's announcement in November 2010. They should ensure that on both the Thameslink & Great Northern routes, better station facilities include improved cycle and car parking facilities, 	<p>In addition to the above, work on LTP3 has also informed the development of a number of other documents, most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Centre Masterplans in Dunstable, Biggleswade, and sites in Leighton Buzzard • The Site Allocations Document as part of the Northern Area Local Development Framework • Ongoing work on the Southern Area Local Development Framework <p>More recently the Local Transport White Paper has been released by the Department for Transport, and we are currently reviewing this document and amending the draft LTP3 Strategy as necessary.</p> <p>I hope that the above answers your queries. As always if you have any further questions, please feel free to contact us.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>improved safety, security, and customer information & waiting facilities, and to ensure that stations are fully accessible for all rail users. To consider in this context joint or match-funding to deliver improvements under the National Stations Improvement Programme, Access for All, or similar schemes.</p> <p>7 Support “Gateway Station” improvements – for example, the redevelopment of the main rail hub at Bedford (Midland) station including the Bedford Station Quarter Redevelopment. Important, given interchange between FCC Thameslink, London Midland ‘Marston Vale’ and East Midlands Trains services. Plus it’s potential along the proposed East-West Rail Link, including future Oxford – Bedford train services.</p> <p>8 Support proposals for the extension of the Marston Vale Line Bedford – Bletchley service to operate to/from Milton Keynes Central, following the Bletchley re-signalling [page 14].</p> <p>9 Support proposals for the proposed new station at The Wixams (planning application 10/02805/MAF submitted to Bedford Borough Council, 23 January 2011).</p> <p>10 Support proposals for future electrification of the Midland Main Line north from Bedford.</p> <p>11 Support proposals for the East-West Rail Link (EWRL) and to lobby for this to be extended eastwards, via its central section, towards the East Coast Main Line, Cambridge & East Anglia. To give every assistance to the East-West Consortium and to work with it in a timely delivery of EWRL, including any financial contribution that this requires. To help deliver EWRL through Growth Area Funding & through the South East Midlands LEP.</p> <p>12 Provide safe, integrated and efficient bus services that permit easy interchange with other modes of transport (but particularly with rail) and that meet the travel needs of customers who choose not to use, or are unable to use, a private car. To extend the Leighton Buzzard <i>Station Travel Plan</i> concept elsewhere within Central Bedfordshire.</p> <p>13 To examine strategic alliances which could help deliver a “Quality Rail Partnership” (similar to that recently introduced in Hertfordshire).</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>14 To examine (in conjunction with others) the potential operation of "Tram-Train" or Parry People Mover (PPM). A possible route could be Luton – Dunstable, if this is a cheaper & more viable option than the proposed guided busway. Please note Cheshire East Council's recent inclusion in their LTP 3 of Tram-Train operation for the (Manchester) – Altrincham – Chester railway line and potential other routes, as an example.</p> <p>15 To consider "match-funding" in conjunction with Network Rail & the Train Operating Companies to bring railway stations up to a more acceptable standard, including accessibility (DDA compliance, etc.).</p> <p>16 To link emerging Town Centre Masterplans (e.g., Flitwick, Leighton Buzzard, Biggleswade) with improvements at those town's railway stations which are important "railheads" [page 51].</p> <p>17 To seek to minimise the future transport impacts of population growth, Central Beds should intend to work through the planning system (LDF) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deliver new developments that are well-served by walking, cycling and public transport (for example, the proposed new railway station at The Wixams). • ensure that new housing developments are supported by the appropriate range of local work opportunities and essential facilities. <p>18 Central Bedfordshire's long-term strategy should contain six long-term transport objectives indicating its priorities. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i to effectively manage and maintain its transport system and its assets ii to enable economic and population growth, whilst minimising impacts on its transport system and environment iii to encourage and enable more active and sustainable ways to travel 	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>iv to improve the connectivity and accessibility of its transport system</p> <p>v to continue to reduce road casualties</p> <p>vi to reduce the negative impacts of travel and transport on people, settlements and the natural environment (for example, Lorry Routing page 63 and Access Restrictions page 70).</p> <p>LTP 3 should aim to provide a transport system within Central Beds that offers real choice in alternatives to the car. For example, rail services in Central Beds encourage the use of a sustainable mode. Central Beds should therefore help the rail industry on its respective key routes between and into the main urban centres - such as Bedford, Luton & Milton Keynes; and on the Great Northern side, Peterborough, Huntingdon, Hitchin & Stevenage.</p> <p><u>Strategic Rail Freight</u> (pages 54 & 76-77)</p> <p>In addition to passenger services, the rail lines in Central Beds are also well used by rail freight. The Council should support the use of rail for the sustainable distribution of freight. This will require rail freight terminals – and potential locations which should be examined (and safeguarded) are Ridgmont (Amazon); Rookery South (Covanta); Sundon (ProLogis/AMB Property). It is suggested that Central Beds consult with the 'Rail Freight Group'.</p> <p>The former Sundon Quarry site (ex. Blue Circle Cement/Lafarge) is being promoted by ProLogis/AMB Property for a proposed Rail Freight Interchange (RFI). This site is located directly adjacent to the proposed new junction 11a on the M1 and the 'to be built' A5/M1 link road, which it is understood will connect North Luton and North Dunstable to the M1 & A5. The proposal is for 157,930 m² (1.7 million ft²) of warehousing in four units. The developers draft scheme includes one rail-linked warehouse and an intermodal terminal, but due to the topography the other</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>warehouses on site would not be directly rail-linked.</p> <p>Existing rail freight terminals at Forders Sidings (Stewartby), Elstow (stone/aggregate terminal), Biggleswade (Plasmor) & Leagrave (Limbury Road) may offer an opportunity for expansion and additional traffic. This could be important for sand & gravel traffic, especially to ensure a sufficient supply of aggregates in the future (ref. Carter Jonas <i>Mineral Report</i>, January 2011).</p> <p><u>Flitwick Railway Station.</u></p> <p>As a Rail User Group representing passengers at Flitwick we are specifically concerned that the draft LTP 3 makes no mention of the "improvements" at Flitwick railway station (either in conjunction with the Town Centre Masterplan [pages 30-31 & 51], or separate from it – as an enhancement to the Thameslink Programme work of platform lengthening. This is curious, given that the BCA understood a GAF bid had gone forward from Central Beds in respect of Flitwick!</p> <p>More glaring however, is the lack of a "Local Area Transport Plan" for Ampthill/Flitwick. Are Central Beds uncertain about what to include in it? The BCA are aware of the proposed (large) housing developments adjacent to the Rufus Centre & the Ampthill bypass; the Woburn Forest Holiday Village (Centre Parcs) development; the Football Centre (of excellence) opposite Redbourne School; the recently published (by Central Beds) draft Housing Strategy - which has an impact locally; and the proposals for a Flitwick-We stoning bypass (no detail for the latter in the draft LTP).</p> <p>The BCA (& others) are seriously concerned that Ampthill/Flitwick appears to have been largely ignored by the document. Not satisfactory, given its population size, Council Tax & Business Rate revenue, amongst other considerations.</p>	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>An examination of the Appendices of the draft LTP 3 shows 'Local Area Transport Plans' as follows for other key settlements in the unitary authority :</p> <p>Appendix J - Arlesey and Stotfold Local Area Transport Plan Appendix K - Biggleswade and Sandy Local Area Transport Plan Appendix L - Dunstable and Houghton Regis Local Area Transport Plan Appendix M - Leighton-Linslade Local Area Transport Plan</p> <p>The BCA might be forgiven, but we had assumed that Ampthill/Flitwick should have been accorded the same status as these other main population centres and growth points within Central Beds. Why was it excluded?</p> <p>Why has no Local Area Transport Plan been drafted for Ampthill/Flitwick? Why are our communities obviously considered less significant than the others? What is the reason(s) for us not having one? Perhaps a full & considered explanation would be helpful, given the land use & transport (planning) issues which the BCA know apply here!</p> <p>Significantly too, mention is made in the draft LTP 3 of major Highway Agency trunk road schemes (e.g., M1 hard shoulder running & A5/M1 link) but no mention whatsoever of Network Rail - i.e., the Thameslink Programme scheme. We now know this is going ahead in full, following Philip Hammond's announcement last November. Why has this largely been ignored? Do Central Beds believe there will be no impact from this rail scheme on the Thameslink route & Great Northern (GN) route stations/station car parks within Central Beds? The GN route stations are equally important, offering access to Huntingdon, Peterborough, Hitchin & Stevenage, aside from London commuting.</p> <p>These are significant & inexcusable failings, suggesting little thought or professional care/prudent management has been given to the draft LTP 3!</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>More oddly though is the fact that the Ampthill/Flitwick "Let's Talk Together" stakeholder consultation is at Redbourne Upper School & Community College in MARCH 2011, yet Central Beds want all responses back on LTP 3 by early February! So in addition to excluding Ampthill/Flitwick from the Local Area Transport Plan process, it is also effectively excluded as a community from serious input into the draft LTP (because no doubt by March it will be too late for changes to be made to the contents of the LTP 3 submission).</p> <p>Only three main factors (in transport strategy) appear to be driving Central Beds :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Highways Agency M1 widening/hard-shoulder running north of Junction 11); 2. The Luton - Dunstable guided busway; 3. The A5/M1 link road - Dunstable Northern Bypass - & new interchange with the M1 motorway at Junction 11A/Chalton. <p>More curious is the fact that unlike other "best practice" local authorities Central Beds appear to have made no attempt to identify priorities from individual Parish & Town Plans. Indeed, have they even asked (locally in the BCA's case) Flitwick Town Council or Ampthill Town Council for their views?</p> <p>Certainly it was not impossible for Central Beds to have undertaken the following (which they appear NOT to have done) :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a Transport Policy Task Group, comprised of elected members & lay representatives (some of whom could have represented specific "User Groups" : Bus, Rail, Taxi, Cycle, Pedestrian, etc.); 2. Circulate all Officers within Central Beds; the Highways Agency; Network Rail; Train Operating Companies; the Rail Freight Group, Bus Companies (Stagecoach, Grant Palmer, Arriva, Centre Bus, etc.); Passenger Focus, LondonTravelWatch, etc. 	

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>3. Parish Planning event workshops; 4. Consultation with individual Parish & Town Councils; 5. Consultation with stakeholders (BBRUA, BCA, BABUS, Cyclists, Pedestrians, Horse Riders, etc.).</p> <p>Sadly Central Beds have not approached the process in a meaningful manner, despite having had nearly two years (April 2009 onwards) to do so!</p> <p>Aside from the lack of any really useful content in the LTP 3, the whole methodology has been flawed. How can this blatant failure be excused?</p> <p>Presumably Central Bedfordshire will be collating the views of all those who have responded to the draft and will be using the information to inform the final LTP 3. It would therefore be most helpful if Central Bedfordshire produces a consultation summary document and circulates this to all respondents in Spring/Summer 2011 following the adoption of the finished LTP.</p>	
<p>Resident, Optometrist – 26 Jan 2011</p>	<p>I would be grateful if you could direct this email to the appropriate person for comment.</p> <p>I have just read through the LTP3 and am saddened at one large omission. Under the health section there is absolutely no recognition of eye care services. Access to optometrists is vital, not only to retain good vision, but because a routine eye examination can often pick up far more generalised disease processes such as high blood pressure, diabetes, and many types of cancer in otherwise normal people. It is also well established that as people become older their vision fails putting them more at risk of falling and contracting blinding eye diseases such as glaucoma. It is therefore vital that access to these health care services should for an integral part of this plan and is clearly a large omission. It is also a fact that much social exclusion is due to poor or lost sight with</p>	<p>With reference to your email regarding the Local Transport Plan received on the 25 January I should like to reply as follows.</p> <p>Firstly thank you for your email; it is extremely helpful for us to receive informed advice from professionals within their field. We have not directly indicated that we will improve access to Optometrists within the LTP3, this is in no way dismissing the importance of such health care, however as you will note we have not directly listed any specialist form of healthcare, the predominant reason for this is that unfortunately with a decrease in available</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>many people rarely leaving their own home environment once severe sight impairment takes a hold. There is no acknowledgment of this at all within the report. Indeed I could find no reference to the blind or partially sighted community within the report at all.</p> <p>It is a shame that such a major part of healthcare and welfare has been omitted from the report. I would ask why this major oversight has been allowed to happen and what the relevant people intend to do to rectify the situation.</p> <p>Many thanks.</p>	<p>budget we have had to set priorities and by setting one of our Objectives to - "Improve Access to healthcare provision by the core health services (hospitals and GP's)" we anticipate that we would be able to cover as many healthcare requirements as possible.</p> <p>We do appreciate however that for some/many people their GP or the hospital would not be the first point of contact when anticipating accessing eye care, and although we do not directly mention individual destinations we do have an objective to - "Ensure access to food and other local services particularly in the town and district centres". In essence by Improving overall access to the town and district centres this would help to improve access to destinations in these areas such as eye care.</p> <p>Similarly, in addition to prioritising the destinations people predominantly want to access we have also set a priority on the locations people are travelling from i.e. priority neighbourhoods and aiding elderly segments of the community, the intention is to improve access for the most vulnerable in society and those most effected by the negative impacts of poor access to health care.</p> <p>I would also add that when implementing schemes we are ensuring that physical works take into account the Disability Discrimination Act and we intend to both improve existing infrastructure to this standard but also ensure that any new developments are built to DDA compliance. Similarly we will be working with bus operators to help ensure that we work towards a programme of ensuring that public transport is DDA compliant by 2015.</p> <p>Finally when undertaking the production of the LTP a Strategic Environmental Assessment was undertaken</p>

Name	Issue	Response
		<p>which includes a Health Impact Assessment, this was used as a tool to check that the LTP3 would aid with enabling people "Access to the Transport system" so that they can access a variety of health care requirements, this can be reviewed as appendix N.</p> <p>I trust that this may help to alleviate your concerns however should you have any further requirements please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
Deborah 24 th January 2011	<p>I think you are all missing a trick. Flitwick Railway Station should be moved to Doolittle Mill/Froghall Road. this will achieve the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Take commuter parking out of Flitwick by using as a parkway station with links to the A507. 2) Give the residence of Ampthill better Access to trains 3) Town Centre Development will be more straightforward in Flitwick. 4) Cycle paths can be constructed from both Ampthill & Flitwick to the new station and so connecting the two towns. 5) New Centre Parcs will be served with little disruption to either town 	<p>Issues surrounding Flitwick station will be looked at as part of the Local Area Transport Plan for Ampthill and Flitwick, due to be developed in 2011/12. Any plans for railway stations will need to be developed in consultation with Network Rail and Train Operating Companies.</p>
Tim 23 rd January 2011	<p>Hi, i have had it on good authority that the reason for (some of) the street lights being replaced, is the fact that they are made of concrete and it has been found that the metal re-enforcement inside have been found to be going rusty and therefore are a lot weaker than they should be to be completely safe.</p> <p>But quite why they haven't removed all the old posts once a new post has been placed a few feet away, I have no idea</p>	<p>These comments relate to an existing scheme. How we manage our highways assets will form part of the Transport Asset Management Plan being developed as part of this Local Transport Plan.</p>
Anderson 22/01/11	<p>The bus service between Houghton Regis and Dunstable, route 38 & 7 is a poor service.</p> <p>Busse s on this route cease to operate on Sunday evenings. Since this change was made a few years ago my wife & I have been unable to go to Dunstable on a Sunday evening as I am a senior citizen & cannot afford taxis.</p> <p>Also this route ceases operation far too early on all other evenings, the</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and for taking the time to respond to the Local Transport Plan your input in greatly appreciated. We will be working with bus operators to ensure that services that are running optimise the potential for ensuring that access is maximised for residents particularly those reliant on public transport however this must be done in conjunction with budget constraints and cuts. Once again thank you for your</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	last bus back to Houghton Regis from Dunstable is at 11.15 PM. It would make a lot more sense if the last bus was at 12.30AM or 1.00AM. The only option at these times is to use a taxi which we cannot afford.	comments
Family 23 rd January 2011	<p>1. We would have preferred to see greater efficiencies & productivity resulting in a reduction in Council Tax in 2011/2012. Residents in Central Beds have suffered unusually high increases for a number of years. The unitary has not shown the savings promised from local government reorganisation.</p> <p>2. The authority has a multiplicity of office locations (Technology House, Dunstable & Chicksands). Any travel between these should be at the Officers/Staff expense; no travel allowance (monetary or time) should be allowed. Council tax payers should not be expected to pay for the failure to concentrate the local authority's functions into a single office location.</p> <p>3. Sharing of back-office administration, IT & other functions should be considered with adjoining authorities. Layers of administration need to be taken out of the organisation.</p> <p>4. Big ticket items requiring capital investment (& consequential interest charges on that capital) should be abandoned in the present economic climate ; Luton – Dunstable guided busway; A5-M1 link road, etc.</p> <p>5. Greater effort needs to be put into addressing the planning & transport issues of the former Mid Beds, rather than a concentration on the former South Beds. A better balance of Portfolio Holders is required to ensure this takes place.</p> <p>6. Not only do office locations need to be rationalised, but first & foremost administration efficiencies need introducing soonest. Layers of management should be further reduced, with less Officers/Deputy Directors & other senior positions. Too many chiefs & not enough indians!</p> <p>7. If the number of councillors is to be reduced this needs to be a fair & representative change based on actual electorate numbers with "equalisation" applying.</p> <p>8. In relation to service provision the economies should not include turning street lighting off and reducing CCTV monitoring; reducing the periodicity of household waste collection or in facilities for collecting and</p>	<p>The key points relating to transport in this query are as so:</p> <p>4. The Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway is a committed scheme with confirmed funding from Government. For the A5-M1 Link, the authority is working with landowners, the Highways Agency, and the Department for Transport to progress the scheme. The scheme has provided the opportunity to work with Central Government to explore new ways of funding a scheme vital to the local economy and securing growth.</p> <p>5. This LTP is closely linked to the planning and development aspirations of the authority, as set out in the Local Development Framework for the Northern Area, and the emerging Core Strategy of the southern area. This is reflected in the first round of Local Area Transport Plans, where two are located in the north of the authority, and two in the south of the authority.</p> <p>10. The LTP has a strong commitment to partnership working with neighbouring local authorities and the South Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>recycling waste; reductions in maintaining highways and footpaths (better to save on new infrastructure & invest in maintaining properly what we already have); removing school crossing patrols (or if this does happen, introducing 20mph speed restrictions outside all schools, irrespective of the class/type of road at all those locations).</p> <p>9. Consider the possibility of a joint Chief Executive possibly with Bedford) to reduce cost.</p> <p>10. Consider the possibility of "joint working" through innovative approaches like the South East Midlands "Local Enterprise Partnership" (LEP) which could save duplication in many key areas : regeneration; planning/development control; highways & transport; education, etc.</p>	
Page, 22/01/11 Myjourney email	<p>I think that you need to think again about the unquestioning support for shared space and for residents' parking schemes.</p> <p>Shared space may slow some drivers down, but you can't require the disabled, including visually disabled, elderly, and young to take the risk that not all drivers will behave responsibly. At a minimum you need clear boundaries (for example by raised paving) to separate the spaces.</p> <p>Resident parking spaces mean that the community is allowing (perhaps with payment) some people to take permanent possession of public space on the roads. I do not want to rent out public space in this way. It would be better to ensure that parking in residential areas was always for limited times, so that it was not suitable for long-term use. People with cars should provide their own space for them. You would not allow a permanent campsite on the street because a family house had too few bedrooms for the occupants.</p>	<p>Firstly we would like to sincerely thank you for taking the time to be involved with the Local Transport Plan and your local comments are extremely useful and helpful.</p> <p>It would be helpful to know where you live so I could then be more specific with my response, however I would like to assure you that before any scheme is implemented there will be local consultation and we would have the opportunity to discuss with local community whether proposed schemes are suitable for their area.</p> <p>I hope this answers your query however should you wish to discuss in further detail please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
Leslie 21 st January 2011	<p>Why is Central Bedfordshire replacing the street lighting in Flitwick? It appears to me that what we have is perfectly serviceable and works.</p> <p>Did I not hear that they wish to turn the street lighting off between 12 and 6 to save money?</p>	<p>These comments relate to an existing scheme. How we manage our highways assets will form part of the Transport Asset Management Plan being developed as part of this Local Transport Plan.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Or do we need new street lighting for them to do this.</p> <p>What is the cost of replacing these lights, Why do they need replaing, and would it not make more sense to use the money wisely and protect the service that are under threat.</p> <p>I guess the answer we are in Central Bedfordshire and they dont have a clue!</p>	
16/01/11 Mawer myjourney email	<p>I have read the plan - very long. A precis of the main points would have been appreciated.</p> <p>I thought I would share some thoughts with you about Leighton Buzzard.</p> <p>A lot of work has been done removing traffic lights in the town and replacing them with roundabouts which has improved the flow of traffic. However some of the new pedestrian crossings are causing traffic back ups and some traffic lights which are left are causing congestion.</p> <p>a) Near Waitrose adjacent to the schools. The traffic is backed up when the children come out of school, because each individual child stops the traffic as they step onto the crossing. Why not have a crossing light? This would ensure that several children cross at once thereby easing the traffic congestion. If there is already a crossing light, nobody uses it.</p> <p>b) As traffic turns left into Tesco there is a pedestrian crossing. Pedestrians are oblivious to traffic at this point and often step onto the crossing without looking or take into account the fact that vehicles are moving and then wonder why they nearly get run down. Traffic travelling in the direction of Waitrose comes to a standstill because the traffic turning left is stationary and blocks the through traffic route whilst people cross - often one at a time. Why not have a pedestrian light there too or move the crossing further along to stop this congestion. It is infuriating.</p> <p>c) The traffic lights at Morrisons cause long tailbacks to the White House roundabout. Could a roundabout be considered? If you want to encourage people to shop locally these are things which need addressing. I avoid coming into town at certain times of the day because of the traffic congestion and will often just not bother and shop</p>	<p>Firstly thank you for taking the time to review and input into the Local Transport Plan for Central Bedfordshire, the informed views of local residents are very useful and valued. Leighton-Linslade is one of four areas to receive finding through the LTP within their Local Area Transport Plans, these plans have been developed but we have not developed technical programmes yet but your comments will be fed into this process where the most economical and practical solutions will be used.. We accept that the provision of Public Transport information is not acceptable in parts of the authority and we have made a commitment in through the Local Transport Plan to begin a programme of works to correct this. For speeding issues you need to first contact the police who would be able to determine the % of non compliance this would then enable the most appropriate measures to be used to mediate the problem. Speed cameras would only be used if there is a series of serious or fatal accidents. We are developing a parking strategy that will help to manage parking more effectively including in new developments, however we have to balance the need to provide car users with adequate facilities against ensuring we provide sustainable solutions and services that are suitable for non-car users.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>elsewhere.</p> <p>d) Parking in the High Street is becoming more difficult as the population increases. Consider parking more vehicles nose to the kerb. This might enable a few more spaces.</p> <p>e) The Royal Mail office in Firbank Way used to have a set of scales and many people would use this office to post parcels and letters rather than driving to the main Post Office in Market Square where parking is difficult and the queues are even longer since the small Post Offices have closed down. The scales have now disappeared and we cannot use Firbank Way any more. When I asked why, I was told "we are a sorting office not the Post Office". Who took the scales away? Head Office or the staff who might have to do more work? God forbid anyone should deliver customer service. Firbank Way providing a service stopped a lot of unnecessary journeys into town. Can you do anything about this?</p> <p>f) Public Transport - most people who live in the villages surrounding Leighton Buzzard have no idea how to get into town by bus from where they live or even if there is a transport system. I recently wanted to travel to Luton Airport from Billington but it proved impossible at the times I wanted to travel during the day. Also the bus from LB did not go direct to the airport and I would have had to change at Luton Parkway. I took a taxi. If you want people to use public transport ensure that routes and timetables are well advertised and accessible. I wouldn't know where to obtain a timetable or who runs the buses....</p> <p>g) Speeding is a problem along the A4146 and for years we have lobbied for a safety camera without success. Why can't something be done about this? The Cuts are not an excuse, as this has been going on for years. Police doing a speed check for half an hour does not solve the problem.</p> <p>h) Parking facilities within new developments are totally inadequate. When is someone going to take on board that a two bedroom property will probably house two people - each with a vehicle? Providing one space per property means that additional vehicles spill out onto adjacent side roads to park, causing problems to existing residents - for example The Wharf by Redrow. This is all part of the anti car driver campaign on</p>	



Name	Issue	Response
	<p>the one hand and greed on the part of the developers. The roads within developments ie Sandhills are too narrow, choked up with parked cars because of inadequate parking facilities and making it difficult for emergency services to get through. What are the Planning people thinking of??? Developers can get more houses in and make more money, but it is Planning that allows it. Public transport is not going to solve these problems. People want to have the choice to drive and adequate parking facilities. Often there is inadequate or no public transport - ie my experience. Older people are not going to start riding bikes either and we have an aging society.....</p> <p>i) I tried to click on the mobile library routes on your website, but it didn't work.</p> <p>j) Several roads could be made one way to make life easier for residents and drivers alike in town. Preventing parking on both sides of the road would also help ie in the road where The Wharf Development is and the new 20mph system has been implemented.</p> <p>Hope my observations help.</p>	
Sandra 16 th January 2011	<p>Firstly, congratulations on a very readable and interesting document.</p> <p>However I am puzzled at the complete omission of Flitwick from this plan. The problems that are experienced in Leighton Buzzard, Dunstable, Arlsey and Sandy (listed on page 280) are also experienced even more in Flitwick. I can't understand why our elected representatives have not pushed for improvements in Flitwick; it is a bigger town than Sandy and Arlsey after all.</p> <p>A number of points that I feel are worth taking further: GO-cycle has worked in Leighton Buzzard; how about trying it in Flitwick?</p> <p>Pre-paid bus tickets: when the J2 bus stops opposite the post office in Flitwick it can take 10 minutes for passengers to pay their fares, holding up the bus and traffic. If no-one paid on the bus, but instead bought their</p>	<p><i>Response by James Gleave on 17th January 2010</i></p> <p>Dear Sandra,</p> <p>Thank you very much for your comments, and for taking the time to read our Local Transport Plan. To respond to your comments in detail:</p> <p>1. I am pleased to say that we are not ignoring Flitwick at all. In fact, during the next financial year (2011/12) we will be developing a Local Area Transport Plan for Ampthill & Flitwick to plan out what schemes we will look to deliver, and we shall consult upon it. We have also set aside funding for forthcoming years for the delivery of schemes in this and other areas not currently covered by Local Area Transport Plans. The reason why we have developed the</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>ticket from local shops (as they do in Europe) this would benefit those shops, make buses run to time and avoid holding up other traffic. Definitely a winner all round.</p> <p>3 I notice that a minimum standard for bus waiting areas (shelters?) is proposed. This should start with the bus stop in Flitwick which is the worst eyesore in the entire county. No-one wants to take responsibility for this, and a councillor from Flitwick told me that "it is regularly improved" (the last time being 9 years ago!!!)</p> <p>I hope that your proposals come to fruition, but please dont neglect Flitwick, its been ignored for too long</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Sandra Robinson</p>	<p>4 Local Area Transport Plans in Arlesey & Stotfold, Biggleswade & Sandy, Leighton-Linslade and Dunstable & Houghton Regis because these are the 4 main growth areas in the authority. We were advised to focus on these areas to start with by members.</p> <p>I am also pleased to say that two junction improvements at Millbrook Junction and Steppingley Junction are also planned over the next couple of years as part of the Centre Parcs development. So keep an eye out for more information on these.</p> <p>2. We are proud of what Go-Cycle Leighton-Linslade have achieved, and are very keen that the lessons learnt from Leighton-Linslade are applied elsewhere. As you can probably imagine, funding for such schemes is limited, and if we were to expand this we would have to bid for something called the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. We are currently working on ideas for this funding, so once again its a case of watch this space for more information.</p> <p>3. Your ideas are interesting, and the prospect of being able to make bus journeys easier by making ticketing much easier is something that most of us would love to see. Doing this in Central Beds would require working with the bus operators, and quite a bit of funding to set up the IT infrastructure to administer it all, so we can't promise it will be delivered. But you may be interested to hear that the Government is interested in delivering a National Smartcard to use on all public transport (similar to the Oyster Card in London), which would do much the same thing as you suggested. Also, we do have a local integrated bus and rail ticket called PlusBus, where you can add local bus travel onto your rail ticket. This can also be done at over 200 other stations nationally too!</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		<p>4. What bus stop are you referring to? If you can provide me the information, i shall see what our Passenger Transport guys can do.</p> <p>Thank you once again for your comments.</p>
Malcolm 15 th January 2011	<p>I understand that the question of withdrawing or reducing public transport subsidies is being discussed.</p> <p>Please may I make a personal plea on behalf of community subsidies generally and for Routes 36A/C specifically? I believe these should be retained for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. People like myself, of whom there are many on this estate, would be seriously disadvantaged. I am elderly, have a back injury and suffer from glaucoma and although I have not yet been refused a drivers' licence on these grounds, for my own safety (and for yours!) I choose not to drive. After nearly 80 years of independence, I now rely on the bus, both for leisure and essential journeys, several times a week. Making alternative provision would cost the authorities much more than the current subsidy.</p> <p>2. The recent improvements to the bus services to Billington Park have begun to attract more fare-paying customers; this cannot be bad for the environment. But people cannot leave their cars for public transport if there is no convenient, affordable public transport to use.</p> <p>3. Leighton Buzzard town centre is currently bucking the national trend and enjoying something of an economic boom. Public transport needs strengthening to support this growth, not go into reverse</p>	<p>The 36A and 36C bus services are publicly-supported bus services, and have been considered as part of Central Bedfordshire's wider Passenger Transport Review. The decision on the future of this and other supported services are currently being taken, and we thank you for your comments.</p> <p>This LTP supports local bus services, and wishes to see an increase in the numbers of people using public transport. We will be working with bus operators to provide an effective, sustainable, and value-for-money local bus service.</p>
Mr Young, 14/01/11 via myjourney email	<p>I have skimmed through the document (unfortunately I feel that at 103 pages long it is too lengthy to read in detail and comment on). I could not find – and was looking for – plans to de-trunk the A5 through Dunstable if the northern bypass gets built and then plans to pedestrianise the centre of Dunstable in a similar fashion to Leighton Buzzard.</p> <p>What is disappointing is that there seems to be plans for a LB Eastern</p>	<p>Mr Young</p> <p>Firstly thank you for your comment on our Local Transport Plan, it is very useful to get specific local information.</p> <p>I hope I can re-assure you that in no way is Dunstable and Houghton Regis losing out with regards to the allocation</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	bypass/relief road with yet again Dunstable losing out.	<p>of funding or schemes to be delivered and I should like to advise as follows:</p> <p>Central Bedfordshire realises there is a more urgent need to prioritise spend within Dunstable, this is demonstrated by the funding allocated to the four areas receiving local transport plan money over the next three years (page 91 of the LTP document) the table on this page clearly demonstrates that Dunstable and Houghton Regis will be receiving substantially more local funding than any other area within central Bedfordshire. If you review page 79/80 of the Local Transport Plan document you will see a section which details all the major schemes that are either already under construction or will be commencing construction over the forthcoming years for the areas in and around Dunstable these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Luton-Dunstable Guided busway • M1 Hard Shoulder Running • A5-M1 link road • Woodside Connection <p>The detrunking of the A5 can only take place following the opening of the A5-M1 link which is due to start construction in 2014 and complete 2016, we are however working with the Highways Agency to try to see if there are some improvements we can make to the A5 prior to de-trunking but these would only be minimal. I have also included the Local Area Transport Plan for Dunstable/Houghton Regis and Page 11 item number 4 details the task of preparation work to begin for de-trunking of the A5 through Dunstable centre which will begin over the next three years. What I will make more explicit in the document is that we will plan to implement the transport elements of the Dunstable Masterplan at a later date, which will include improvements for pedestrians etc.</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		<p>It should also be noted that the East of Leighton Distributor Road is seen as a fundamental requisite to enabling the development of 2500 houses, schools, new employment areas etc and as such is being funded by the developers and not Central Bedfordshire Council.</p> <p>I hope this has gone some way to reassuring you as to Central Bedfordshire Councils commitment to Dunstable however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
Kim 11 th January 2011	<p>I have been crossing the High Street on my way to work for several years now and cannot stress how important it is to have the school crossing patrol there. Children, in particular young lads, are reluctant to use the zebra crossing further down and on the couple of occasions when for some reason there hasn't been any assistance available I have witnessed groups trying to cross in between stationary traffic with vehicles hurtling down the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>Cut costs in other areas, not one which puts the lives of school children in Flitwick at risk.</p>	<p>The decision on the future of School Crossing Patrols in Central Bedfordshire is still being considered by the authority following public consultation. By the time this LTP is published, the future of School Crossing Patrols should be clearer.</p> <p>As part of the Local Area Transport Plan process the authority has considered the safety impacts of withdrawing School Crossing Patrols. Should the decision be taken to remove the School Crossing Patrols, funding has been set aside to provide replacement crossing facilities in the most high risk areas.</p>
Mr Wright,. 07/01/11, myjourney email	<p>Oxon and Bucks Rail Action Committee, a voluntary group seeking rail services between Oxford /Aylesbury and Milton Keynes for Bedford and ultimately East Anglia, wish to make the following points on behalf of our members in your area and those who will benefit from such services:</p> <p>We warmly welcome the recognition of the importance of East West Rail Link in the LTP. EWRL will provide a major link to the area and improve wider access and connectivity to the rail network for the area. It is unclear how the council will assist the proposals to fruition. Hopefully, they will continue to proactively work with the East West Rail Consortium and help identify a route for the central section and support funding bids and developer contributions where appropriate. We welcome the recognition the line has potential for freight. Development sites on</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to read and comment on the LTP and your knowledgeable opinion is greatly appreciated. Due to engagement responses we have updated the LTP to include the enclosed text which discusses Thameslink and Wixams amongst others, please see the enclosed.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>Bedford-Bletchley line could seek to encourage use of the rail link and possibly freight depots.</p> <p>The authority also has role to contribute to consultations on RUS and rail franchise proposals which can highlight the EWRL potential and may offer funding options (eg Chiltern Railways have undertaken major infrastructure investments within their franchise).</p> <p>Moreover, the Council can monitor rail service performance (as they will buses) and seek improvements and make representations to Dft. Rail interchanges and car parking are other issues to consider and new developments access to rail. Financial contributions to encourage rail improvements are made by councils (subject to funding availability)</p> <p>We note impact of Thameslink seems not to have been mentioned or the Wixams development (if in your area),</p>	
Lesley 10 th January 2011	<p>It would be an absolute disaster to get rid of our lollypop ladies. They do an absolute brilliant job in all weathers getting our children and us parents safely across two horrendously busy main roads in Flitwick. Surely there must be a more sensible way of saving money other than axing the lollypop ladies.</p>	<p>The decision on the future of School Crossing Patrols in Central Bedfordshire is still being considered by the authority following public consultation. By the time this LTP is published, the future of School Crossing Patrols should be clearer.</p> <p>As part of the Local Area Transport Plan process the authority has considered the safety impacts of withdrawing School Crossing Patrols. Should the decision be taken to remove the School Crossing Patrols, funding has been set aside to provide replacement crossing facilities in the most high risk areas.</p>
Resident – 07/01/11 via customer contact centre	<p>Are you liaising with Milton Keynes Council which is also preparing its LTP3 submission at the moment?</p>	<p>Thank you for your query regarding our LTP3, I can confirm that we have been liaising with all of our neighbours throughout the process of creating the LTP3, this has taken place via emails, meetings and workshops, which ever method has been most appropriate for those authorities. We have also coordinated our strategies and policies wherever possible to maximise the opportunities for joint working.</p> <p>I hope this answers your questions, however please do</p>



Name	Issue	Response
		not hesitate to contact us.
Leslie 6 th January 2011	<p>How much does Central Bedfordshire think it's going to save by removing the school crossing patrols? Let's look at the facts. There are 29 school crossing patrols and 6 standby patrols. They earn the lowest pay scales within the authority for 2 ½ hours per day (some work less than this) out in all weathers to safely see the children to school. Standby patrols are paid a small retainer (and I mean small). How many people would do this for such a pittance if they were not committed? Is this really big salary numbers and savings we are talking about here? I think NOT.</p> <p>So let's make them all redundant comes the cry from Central Bedfordshire. How much is this going to cost? Whilst the school crossing patrols do not earn high salaries, they are all committed people who have worked for many years providing a much needed service to the population of Central Bedfordshire and what was the old Bedfordshire County Council. Whilst not meaning to be ageist the majority of the school crossing patrols will be entitled to the age multiplier of 1.5 for redundancy payments.</p> <p>Whilst the so called Councillors who are elected by all of us think that parents should take their children to school as it's their responsibility, in practice this does not happen. It's obvious that the councillors are "out of touch" with what actually happens.</p> <p>Now let's see what other crazy idea Central Bedfordshire is to have next. It is rumoured that the school crossing patrols could be replaced by installing additional crossings at the points now covered by the crossing patrols. How much is this going to cost and what would be the pay off time between a salary and this investment. I guess they will come up with the idea that this cost will come from another budget cost centre.</p> <p>Worst of all it's your Childs life at risk! The cost of caring for one child injured in a road accident is astronomic and would certainly cost more than the total cost of the provision of the school crossing patrol across Central Bedfordshire. A Child killed what price Central Bedfordshire can put on this.</p> <p>You need to protect your services.</p> <p>Write to your local councillor and tell them that you do not approve of</p>	<p>The decision on the future of School Crossing Patrols in Central Bedfordshire is still being considered by the authority following public consultation. By the time this LTP is published, the future of School Crossing Patrols should be dearer.</p> <p>As part of the Local Area Transport Plan process the authority has considered the safety impacts of withdrawing School Crossing Patrols. Should the decision be taken to remove the School Crossing Patrols, funding has been set aside to provide replacement crossing facilities in the most high risk areas.</p>

Name	Issue	Response
	<p>this cost cutting. Tell them that they will lose your vote at the next election that usually motivates any Politician. Sign a petition, over 1500 signatories have signed in Flitwick. Make your voice heard. Perhaps those at the top who earn more money than is reasonable for the positions should take a pay drop to show that they are all interested in cost cutting. I guess not, "I am all right jack" can be heard from the senior officers and counsellors at Central Bedfordshire. Or perhaps let's spend more money on "Welcome to Central Bedfordshire" signs</p>	

DRAFT



Biggleswade & Sandy LATP: Amendments

This note forms a summary of the points raised and amendments made to the Biggleswade and Sandy Local Area Transport Plan following final consultation with the Biggleswade Town Centre Partnership on 2 February 2011.

Page	Issue	Amendments to Strategy
1	Number of appendix incorrect	Appendix number changed to 'L'
5	Typo reference to Arlesey and Stotfold	Text amended to Biggleswade and Sandy.
5 & 49	Concern over the lack of consultation undertaken	Cross reference to the Engagement and Communications chapter of the LTP included, together with a summary of all meetings held with members and other representatives in a revised Appendix F.
9 + others	Use of census information	The 2001 Census is the only available source of information for some statistics. The LATP will be reviewed annually and updated when more up to date information is available.
9	Consistency of population quoted	Amended to read 16,400 in each instance quoted.
9	Concern over accuracy of travel times to London	Times amended to reflect latest timetable.
10	Use of word 'earmarked'	Substituted for 'proposed'
11	Query as to the accuracy of the build rate for land east of Biggleswade	Latest housing trajectory included
14	Text should reflect that contained in the latest version of the Town Centre Master plan	Text has been amended accordingly
14	Inappropriate reference to town centre as transport hub	Replaced with town centre 'area'
15	Reference to the Biggleswade Transport Study 2008 is inappropriate as it doesn't have any official status	Text removed.
17	Concern that not all people can be expected to walk 2 miles.	Text amended to reflect concern.
18 + others	Quote actual figures instead of percentages when talking about survey results.	Where possible actual figures have been included alongside percentage figures of survey results.
21	Concern over accuracy of car ownership levels	Detail of car ownership levels included
21	Reference to anecdotal delays should be amended	Text changed to refer to 'observed' delays
23	Don't refer to all of the relevant off street car parks	List replaced with new table to include all car parks
23	Don't say it is easy to park on street because it may encourage others to do so when it has a detrimental impact on local residents	Reference to 'significant' removed and paragraph amended to say that on street parking is available but that it does have the potential to impact upon the amenity of local residents.
25	Unduly negative tone to the statement that the local authority has a lack of control of	Reference removed.



Page	Issue	Amendments to Strategy
	the management of off street car parking	
26	Remove reference to the cost of residents parking schemes.	Paragraph removed.
30	Need clarification as to what type of food shopping we are referring to.	Reference to 'main food shopping' added
31	Need to recognise that will not be able to remove freight from the town centre due to the location of major employers	Text added to reflect this and say that we will work closely with operators to ensure impacts of movements are minimised.
33	Access to Franklin Recreation Ground is not a problem.	Reference removed.
33	Access to health care wouldn't be via Saffron Road and is subject to the future location of the health centre.	Access details amended to Foundry Road and Hitchin Street with caveat to say subject to the future location of the health centre.
34	Would use Eagle Farm Road to access Saxon Pool.	Reference included.
36 + overall	Concern as to the level of engagement and scheme specific concerns	Sentence added to state that local members and stakeholders will have opportunity to comment on individual scheme proposals at design and implementation stage
37	Lack of schemes in programme	Programme has been updated and schemes included following receipt from Amey
37	Would rather have a pelican crossing than a zebra crossing on Potton Road and Drove Road.	Detail of the scheme design will be addressed at a later date, but more generic reference to crossing included within LAMP.
38	Accuracy of the schemes secured for funding through Section 106 agreements	Table amended to reflect latest position on agreements in place.
42	Objection to the inclusion of selected other schemes table as not been consulted on their go ahead	Table removed due to the lack of status of these schemes.



DRAFT



Appendix 1:

Public consultation

report



Contents

Introduction.....	3
Process.....	4
Results	5
Dunstable	5
Arlesey Railway Station.....	5
Arlesey Village Hall.....	6
Stotfold	6
Sandy.....	7
Leighton-Linslade.....	8
Houghton Regis	8
Biggleswade	9
Any Other Information	10
Conclusion.....	11
 Appendices - Consultation Feedback	
Appendix One – Press Release.....	12
Appendix Two – Dunstable.....	14
Appendix Three – Arlesey.....	15
Appendix Four – Stotfold.....	16
Appendix Five – Sandy.....	17
Appendix Six – Leighton-Linslade.....	19
Appendix Seven – Houghton Regis	21
Appendix Eight – Biggleswade.....	23



Introduction

Amey, on behalf of Central Bedfordshire Council, were invited to undertake a series of public consultations during August 2010 for the third Local Transport Plan (LTP3), as part of the “myjourney” campaign. The aim of the campaign was to raise the profile of local transport provisions and make it feel more relevant to local residents. The public consultations were arranged to provide local residents with an opportunity to get involved and provide feedback on transport issues in their local area. These opinions were then collated to be fed into the overall LTP for Central Bedfordshire.

DRAFT



Process

To initiate the process, Amey co-ordinated a schedule of venues and available dates based on the four key areas, determined by Central Bedfordshire Council, that were to be targeted: -

- Dunstable and Houghton Regis
- Arlesey and Stotfold
- Leighton-Linslade
- Sandy and Biggleswade

High profile venues were chosen in each of the seven towns, which were likely to attract high footfall from local residents to maximise coverage in each area. As such, eight consultations were co-ordinated and run across the four key areas.

To raise the public's awareness of the consultations, a press release was prepared for distribution to the local media in Central Bedfordshire, to notify the public as to the dates, times and locations for each consultation. A copy of the final press release is included in Appendix One, after the relevant approvals were sought. The article featured in the Bedfordshire on Sunday, Biggleswade Chronicle and Bedford Today, with local councillors also informed separately of the consultations, via Central Bedfordshire Council. Alongside the press release, the Let's Talk Central website was updated to contain details of the consultations and the key focus questions. Central Bedfordshire Council also notified the following social media groups of the consultation timetable: -

- Dunstable – Long Live Dunstable Facebook group, This is Dunstable twitter, Dunstable Downs twitter
- Arlesey – Arlesey social club Facebook page
- Stotfold – The Chequers Pub in Stotfold (has approximately 350 members)
- Biggleswade and Sandy – Biggleswade and Sandy news twitter
- Leighton-Linslade – Leighton-Linslade town council Facebook group
- Houghton Regis – HR town council news desk Facebook group.

Amey ensured that each area consultation was appropriately manned by either Amey employees or Central Bedfordshire Council employees. For certain consultations, it was ensured that the Amey employee in attendance was active in the local area and potentially well-known by local Councillors and special interest groups.

To guarantee consistency at each consultation, the same exhibition stand and information leaflet were used. Highways Helpdesk cards were also made available, in order for local residents to report issues on the network that could investigate via Amey rather than issues for the local transport plan. A4 size leaflets were created, using the same template as the A5 leaflet, if people wanted to share additional thoughts on local transport provisions and the Local Transport Plan.

All employees were briefed beforehand to ensure they understood the consultation process centred around three key questions: -

1. *What is the biggest transport issue that affects your daily life?*
2. *If you could improve one thing about transport in your area, what would it be?*
3. *What can be done to encourage more people to walk, cycle, and use public transport?*

Alongside, the public consultations, Central Bedfordshire Council continued to run the partner and key stakeholder collaboration programme. Details of upcoming meetings and dates were taken to each consultation in order to provide this information to local residents and Councillors, if required.



Results

Dunstable – Friday 6th August

Information about the Day

On Friday 6th August, Amey attended Dunstable Town Market between 9am and 5pm. The Town Market runs regularly each Wednesday, Friday and Saturday. Arriving at the market between 9 – 9.30 am, the exhibition stand was set up on an intersection in the town, which received regular footfall throughout the day, see photo. Leaflets were distributed at the stall until around 5pm. As a regular market taking place on Saturdays, Wednesdays and Fridays, Dunstable was popular with local residents. The peak footfall on the Friday occurred between late morning and early afternoon. The weather was overcast with only brief interludes of light rainfall, although this did not appear to have a significant detrimental impact upon overall levels of footfall.



Number of People Talked To

Approximately 100 people were spoken to during the day at Dunstable Market. Some of these were interested in talking for short periods of time, whereas others took leaflets away with them with the intention of filling them in later or on line.

Summary of Public Responses

A summary of the feedback received at Dunstable follows: -

- Bypass needed to remove the through traffic in Dunstable
- Road congestion is problematic, although the bypass would resolve this
- There are no buses available for residents to travel to local towns
- The bus services need to run later into the evenings
- More cycle paths are needed, to encourage residents to cycle.

Further detailed responses can be found in Appendix Two.

Arlesey Railway Station – Wednesday 11th August 2010

Information about the Day

Amey visited Arlesey railway station on Wednesday 11th August between 7am and 12pm. Arriving at the railway station at 7am ensured a presence at the railway station during the busiest time of the day to target the maximum amount of commuters. There were high levels of footfall through the station throughout the morning, particularly during the commuter rush between 7am and 9am. Both station platforms were accessible as well as the station foyer to maximise leaflet distribution. Periods of engagement with individuals were relatively short, as people were generally trying to get their trains. However, the day was clear and sunny, which encouraged more people to commute and use the railway station.



Number of People Talked To

Approximately 200 leaflets were distributed, but this was difficult to estimate due to short windows of opportunity to liaise with commuters.

Summary of Public Responses

Few opportunities were available to gather feedback from local residents at the railway station, as they were preoccupied trying to catch their trains. However, residents' primary concern surrounded the local buses, especially a new local service serving the railway station, as the bus timetable and train timetables do not coincide.

Arlesey Village Hall – Wednesday 11th August 2010

Information about the Day

Amey visited Arlesey Village Hall, on Arlesey High Street, on Wednesday 11th August in the early evening. The village hall was chosen because Arlesey railway station is not staffed after midday, and therefore the decision was made that it would not be beneficial to exhibit at the railway station in the afternoon. Amey arrived at the Village Hall at around 4pm to meet local residents after work, staying until approximately 8pm. The weather was clear and bright, and due to the inside nature of the consultation, local residents were willing to attend and engage in in-depth discussions without needing to complete any other activities. The majority of people that attended knew about the consultation in the Village Hall due to the local publicity before the event.

Number of People Talked To

12 people from Arlesey attended the consultation session, including two Councillors from Arlesey.

Summary of Public Responses

The feedback received from local residents at Arlesey included: -

- Local bus services – low frequencies and some nearby towns not served, or under-served
- Concerns on proposed development and expansion of Arlesey and the subsequent transport implications including a relief road, additional through traffic on Arlesey High Street
- Parking issues – railway station parking proves particularly difficult
- The cost of using public transport is too high which detracts residents from using it
- Frequency of bus and train services is restrictive for local residents
- Cycle paths need to be improved to encourage local cyclists.

Further detailed responses for both sessions at Arlesey can be found in Appendix Three.

Stotfold – Thursday 12th August 2010

Information about the Day

At Stotfold, the exhibition stand was set up just outside the entrance to the Co-op in the town centre at 2pm, opposite a residential area. The Co-op is the largest retail outlet in Stotfold. Amey were allocated the undercover entrance foyer outside the Co-op on Thursday afternoon and evening. The Co-op was very busy with continual passing trade for most of the afternoon and evening, although towards the end of the evening (8pm), the Co-op trade decreased. Whilst many people were seen in this session, few of them were willing to stop and talk, as they wanted to quickly do their shopping or visit the Post Office and go home. A few local residents did stop to converse but primarily leaflets were distributed, so people could respond in their own time either by post or online. There were also intermittent heavy rain showers all afternoon and evening, which prevented some individuals wanting to talk for long periods of time, although the Co-op remained busy throughout.



Number of People Talked To

Approximately 127 people were spoken to in Stotfold across the session, although the majority of these people were seen between 3pm and 5pm.

Summary of Public Responses

To summarise the feedback from the consultations at Stotfold: -

- More public transport is needed, although the recent commencement of a new bus service was highly valued
- The bus service needs to run more regularly
- Bus service needs to connect Stotfold to the rest of Bedfordshire and North Hertfordshire
- Cycle paths need to be safer to use to encourage cycling

Further responses can be found in Appendix Four. However, there were some key reasons raised by residents who didn't want to provide any feedback on the day: -

- "We don't have any issues"
- "We drive a car"
- "I don't want to risk my own life"
- "Don't use it"

Many of the people seen in Stotfold felt that because they drove a car, they didn't have any thoughts on local transport issues or didn't want to use local transport.

Sandy – Friday 13th August 2010

Information about the Day

On Friday 13th August, Amey attended Sandy Town Market, held every Friday between 9am and 5pm. The exhibition stand was erected amongst the other market traders; positioned between a popular food and sweet stall, a flower stall and the Labour Party; although the Labour Party representatives left around lunch time. The location was good, and a regular stream of people continually walked past the stand for most of the day. Many people were willing to talk for a considerable length of time during the morning session, as the weather was bright and dry. In the afternoon, heavy rain set in, which reduced residents' response times; however, leaflets were distributed to local residents to complete online or by post.

Number of People Talked To

Approximately 35 people were spoken to over the day – 30 in the morning and 5 in the afternoon. However, this was caused by the heavy rain which began at lunchtime. In the morning, one individual stopped to talk for 45 minutes, and two individuals stopped for 20 minutes each afterwards. Three local Councillors also purposely visited the stand to share their views.

Summary of Public Responses

To summarise the feedback from Sandy Town Market: -

- The A1 roundabout needs improving as cars cross the roundabout too quickly, and it is often used as a cut-through
- Central Bedfordshire Council and Bedford Borough Council bus services need to co-ordinate with each other
- Bus services need to provide a more regular service
- Increased displays of bus information required i.e. timetables, services etc.

More detailed responses from Sandy can be found in Appendix Five.



Leighton-Linslade – Saturday 14th August 2010

Information about the Day

On Saturday 14th August, Amey attended Leighton-Linslade Town Market, which runs every Tuesday and Saturday. The exhibition stand had a presence in the market from 9am to 4.30pm. The day was generally productive with local residents willing to stop and talk. The exhibition stand was located in a prominent position near the cross in the centre of Leighton-Linslade, outside a branch of LloydsTSB, which enabled conversations with the passing trade. The weather was rather indement, with some very heavy



downpours at lunchtime and into the afternoon, which reduced the number of people willing to stop at these times. However, the rain did not prevent people coming to visit the market during the course of the day. The market generously supplied a covered stall, which meant the exhibition materials were protected during the rain, see photo.

Number of People Talked To

Around 68 people were spoken to at the Town Market. People were generally willing to stop and talk for short periods of time before continuing with their shopping.

Summary of Public Responses

Overall, the feedback from Leighton-Linslade was positive with many people commenting on the bus service and local cycle paths: -

- The bus service is generally good, as is all other public transport in Leighton-Linslade
- Further bus information is required to encourage the use of public transport
- Footpaths are narrow and uneven, there need to be improved to encourage more walking
- Bus service needs to be extended to new housing estates
- Buses need to start earlier in the morning and finish later at night.

Further detailed feedback from Leighton-Linslade can be found in Appendix Six.

Houghton Regis – Friday 20th August 2010

Information about the Day

On Friday 20th August, Amey attended Houghton Regis library, which opens every day of the week between 9am and 5.30pm. The library employees were very helpful and allocated the front foyer of the library to the exhibition stand; this was a prominent position allowing every person who visited the library the ability to see the stand. The library witnessed a steady stream of people for most of the day, some of which who were willing to talk. These individuals were usually by themselves and had time to talk in depth, some staying for up to 30 minutes. Many of the individuals who came to the library were mothers with young children who were willing to talk for short periods of time, but needed to keep their children entertained and therefore couldn't stay for a considerable length of time.

Number of People Talked To

Approximately 19 people were spoken to at Houghton Regis. Some of these had visited the exhibition stand especially as they had seen the article in the local press. Most of the individuals



seen took information leaflets away to give to their neighbourhoods or other local residents who couldn't visit the library.

Summary of Public Responses

General feedback from Houghton Regis included: -

- Speeding traffic on Bedford Road needs to be addressed
- Further information and education required on public transport routes for local residents
- Bus service is generally good but service needs to be extended further to more housing estates and needs to coincide with work and educational facilities
- Footpaths and cycle paths need improving to encourage people to use them correctly, i.e. not cycling on the footpaths.

Further detailed responses from Houghton Regis can be found in Appendix Seven.

Biggleswade – Saturday 21st August 2010

Information about the Day

On Saturday 21st August, Amey attended the Charter Market at Biggleswade, which takes place every Saturday, between 9.30am and 4pm. An excellent location was sourced in the market alongside the other market traders, and outside Lloyds Pharmacy, which encouraged nearby footfall. The weather stayed bright during the morning, which meant the market was busy and people were willing to stop and talk, see photo. The afternoon session was slightly less productive, as the weather turned for the worse and the rain kept some local people away from the market.



Number of People Talked To

Approximately 93 people were seen all day – split into 67 in the morning and 26 in the afternoon.

Summary of Public Responses

To summarise the feedback received at Biggleswade market: -

- Pavements need improving and more dropped kerbs required for mobility scooters
- Footway surfaces need to be improved, such as levelling pavements and clearing debris
- Not enough parking spaces available in the town
- Roads to local villages need improving
- More buses are needed between the local villages and Biggleswade
- Bus service needs to improve, such as late night services and buses to the railway station.

All responses from Biggleswade can be found in Appendix Eight.



Any Other Information

At every consultation details were recorded of individuals who wanted to be kept informed and also any other information that may prove useful for future consultations.

Only one individual wanted to be kept informed of upcoming progress with the Local Transport Plan, who gave his details to James Gleave. He had an issue regarding local buses, and he had not received any response to his initial query to another CBC Officer.

Amey collected additional information and development areas at each consultation, which were collated and reviewed based on the experiences witnessed. Some of these experiences may have affected the response rates in the local area.

- **Stotfold** - Only a few people seemed to attend because they had seen the press coverage, most people seen were passing trade. Further promotional activity would have been required to increase footfall via press coverage
- **Sandy** - Further assessment of the weather forecast would have been beneficial. As the exhibition stand was not covered, this caused difficulties with the rain as the public had nowhere to shelter when they wanted to stop and talk
- **Leighton-Linslade** – The covered market stall was very useful, especially with the afternoon showers. After the consultation session, Amey dropped off some information leaflets at the White House, Citizone and the Library
- **Biggleswade** - For most of the morning, a team of interviewers were asking local people questions about the town centre, to determine how the centre could be improved. The survey was being completed on behalf of Sam Caldbeck from Central Bedfordshire Council; it may be beneficial to compare notes made in the future.



Conclusion

Overall, each of the consultation sessions went well with a good public turnout. A range of public behaviours were witnessed at the consultations – people who just wanted to take a leaflet home, those who wanted to quickly share their issues or comments, and others who wanted to talk in detail about proposed schemes and their local area. This meant the dynamics at each consultation were all very different. For many of the consultation sessions the weather was rather indement and therefore may have impacted upon the number of people who wanted to stop and share their views. Whilst the weather cannot easily be planned for, it would have been wise to prepare further for uncertain weather conditions. However, this did not cause a negative effect at most of the consultations.

As shown in the attached appendices, local residents had a range of issues to share about transport provisions in their local areas and what could be done to improve these. Key themes that occurred across many of the consultations were regarding the provision of bus services – lack of late night services after 6pm, lack of travel information available and lack of joined up services between Central Bedfordshire, Bedford Borough and Hertfordshire. Cycle paths were also another key topic, which were mentioned at most consultations, whereby local residents wanted additional and tidier cycle paths to make it safer to cycle within Central Bedfordshire.



Central Bedfordshire in contact



on the telephone...

0300 300 8000



by email...

customer.services@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk



on the web...

www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk



Alternatively, you can write to:

Central Bedfordshire Council Priory House, Monks Walk,
Chicksands, Shefford, Bedfordshire, SG17 5TQ.

Serving our communities

Find out more...

Get in touch if you would like further copies, a large-print edition or more information about this publication

More information

Për Informacion

للمعلومات

ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਲਈ

برای اطلاع

Per Informazione

معلومات کے لئے

Informacja

Za Informacije

তথ্যের জন্য

Please recycle me!

When you have finished, please put me in your recycling bin or bag

**Central
Bedfordshire**