

**894.15209 - (Corporation Street Area, Preston, Preston City) (Revocations and Various Moving Restrictions)**

Support with Comment

- I live in Brunel Court and if the one-way section in Heatley Street were introduced the new route I would need to get home which would be a 0.7 mile detour. It's not only the distance, it's the additional traffic that people who live in the building which I believe is about 45 vehicles who would need to use that diversion each day as they return home to the accommodation, also the corner is the entrance to the retail park meaning if these people also use the same route that they would be subject to this new diversion also. I completely agree with this new one-way road however, sometimes people use the road as a get-between to try and avoid traffic. I would also be for removing the parking on these roads as they can cause backups. I have also included a new proposal which would move the proposed no entry sign back slightly which would ensure that the people who live in Brunel Court and also staff members of the stores in the retail park would not need to take a big diversion to get back to their accommodations potentially in extremely busy periods adding up to 10 minutes to the route.
- If the one-way on Maudland Bank does not continue beyond Pedder Street and the plan does not include the removal of the bollards on Maudland Bank after Tuson Drive, which prevents traffic from utilising Maudland Bank as a throughfare (or rat run) to Fylde Road, then I have no objection to the proposed changes.

Objections

- We have been restricted access from Maudland Bank to Fylde Road since the bollards were implemented to prevent vehicle access and are now faced with no access to Maudland Road or Leighton Street.
- No statement of reason was provided to explain the one-way section on Maudland Bank and I object on this basis.
- Objection to the short one-way section (except cycles) on Maudland Bank. I do not believe this is necessary and will make traffic much worse along the main road (A583) at peak times and create more risk to pedestrians where there is a high flow of traffic already and a high volume of pedestrians too.
- The introduction of a one-way section between Maudland Road and Pedder Street would have a crucial impact on students and my neighbours in the area. I am a student paramedic and drive this way every day on my way back from Kendal ambulance station. To make this stretch one-way would mostly impact my neighbours and I as we would have to go a more congested route when travelling from north Preston back to our homes and would significantly increase my journey time after a 12-hour shift.
- I object to the introduction of a short one-way section, as promoting primary arterial routes creates further unnecessary congestion at peak times, potentially impacting students. However, the recent introduction of a 'no right turn' sign on the Maudland Road - Fylde Road junction serves a good purpose if anyone paid any attention to it (No one does). Fixing this issue will probably help a great deal more towards the council's objective than introducing a one-way strip.
- Along with many other residents I cannot see any logic in proposing a one-way section South to North over the very short bridge before the junction of Pedder Street and Maudland Bank. As a local resident I am very much aware that the majority of traffic appears to travel South to North already. Of those travelling North to South many are local residents from Maudland Bank, St Walburge Avenue or Pedder Street, if this section became one-way we would have to travel an extra ½ mile to head South or East, which would add to local pollution in the centre of town rather than diminish it. I particularly object to this change because it doesn't seem to be based on any factual information, only 'traffic modelling' which we know is only as good as the variables that are entered into the software. Given that a large part of central Preston has

been dug up for over two years and continues to be so, I would like to suggest that a possible resolution would be to wait until all the road works are completed and then undertake suitable traffic monitoring to find out how the roads around Maudland Bank are actually being used. Any change to traffic flow would then be based on real world factual data and could be a basis for a proper consultation with local residents.

- In terms of the proposals for a one-way street and traffic calming measures in the area the position of the residents is that they would like matters to remain the same for the time being. Representations we have received is a concern around the need for accessibility for elderly and disabled residents which potentially would be more difficult if these new schemes are introduced. The residents' position is one that they would like the situation monitored in line with a number of wider changes in the city centre area and if there is an increase danger consider making the change then. At the moment we are unsure what the situation will be following some significant changes to the wider area.
- I strongly object to the proposal of making the length between Maudland Rd to Pedder St one-way from south to north as this would increase journey times and create more traffic onto Marsh Lane / Fylde Rd and the Ringway and would isolate the residents of Maudland Bank, Tuson Drive and St Walburge Ave who use the above route to the south of Preston. You say it's to prioritise pedestrians, cycling and bus movements, well I've never seen more than one or two cycles on Pedder St / Maudland Bank the bus only goes north through the junction and it's never been used as a rat run so it looks like someone has come up with a scheme to make things awkward for the motorists of Preston. I've lived on the estate for more than 40 years and never had a problem getting in and out of the estate but now you seem to be making it impossible for the motorists that live in the city centre. If the proposal goes through, which no doubt it will, can the residents of Maudland Bank, Tuson Drive and St Walburge Avenue be exempt from the one-way on Maudland Bank?
- Visiting the location of the proposed one way on Maudland Bank, it is obvious that the vast majority of traffic already drives south to north and it is felt that making this section of road one way will only serve to inconvenience the local residents who seem to be the only ones that want to drive north to south, and as a result would have to drive at least an extra half a mile to navigate this one way system. Is the resulting air pollution really worth it? Whilst on site I witnessed cars speeding south to north on Leighton St. cutting the corner quite dramatically onto Maudland Rd and even turning right at the end onto the A583 where it's meant to be a left only turn. This begs the question, if this short stretch of road is made one way, how will it be enforced when speed isn't and when neither is turning left instead of right? I whole heartedly agree with and support the residents' request to wait until all the roadworks around the university have finished and then properly monitor and assess the situation.
- The scheme will result in additional traffic using Maudland Bank to turn round when they find out that they cannot turn right at the Maudland Bank end of Pedder Street. Maudland Bank and Tuson Drive are currently a quiet cul-de-sac with only residents' and delivery traffic. If the one-way section is implemented, it will be possible that 44 tonne, articulated trucks will use Maudland Bank as a turning space. The only part of Maudland Bank with sufficient space for large trucks to turn is at its junction with Tuson Drive. (Maudland Bank is not a main road. The carriageway width of Maudland Bank is only 6.8 m. This is reduced to 4.9 m at two points, where parking is allowed.)
- Petition response (80 signatures) – Our objections relate to the proposed one- way restriction on Maudland Bank (South to north, between the junction's with Maudland Road and Pedder St). The reasons for our objections are:
  - we see no benefits for the overall traffic management scheme currently being implemented on Ringway, Corporation Street, Friargate and surrounding streets

- the proposed change will have a detrimental effect on the residents of Maudland Bank, Tuson Drive and Saint Walburge's Ave, in that it will force residents into longer journeys when travelling to the north, south and east of Preston and beyond. Using Google Earth we estimate increased journey mileage of at least 0.5 miles.
- In addition to the extra mileage incurred, I understand that wellfield road and Ashton street are to be fitted with anti-speed bumps/cushions which will increase the wear and tear on our vehicle suspensions by forced use of these roads.
- We do not believe the effects of these proposals on the residents of Maudland Bank, Tuson Drive and St Walburge's Avenue have been given due consideration in the planning and development of this traffic management scheme. We suggest that the one-way restriction is not implemented, but the rest of the traffic management scheme is completed. Then the volume and direction of traffic is monitored for a period of time to assess their need for the one-way restriction under real traffic conditions.
- The proposal to make Leighton St/Maudland Bank one way at the junction with Pedder Street is an absolute joke. If coming in at Fylde Road turn into Maudland Rd and right into Leighton Street and straight ahead onto Maudland Bank or left into Pedder St is not a rat run. Then why is the opposite direction, Pedder St, and right onto Leighton Street considered a rat run? Same roads, just the other way round. The common factor here is UCLan, they clearly don't want vehicles around their campus which is why the no entry sign will be placed on the junction of Pedder Street, Leighton Street and Maudland Bank, and is also why the Corporation Street bus lane is going to be 24/7. I wouldn't mind but students are only here for part of the year. Please do not insult either my intelligence or the intelligence of the people of Preston by telling us that it is for the best and making Preston a better and safer place to travel for all.
- The scheme will cause an increase in traffic using Edward Street as a rat run which would cause serious problems for deliveries to my business due to limited width to pass.

**894.15210 - The introduction of bus stop clearways on Corporation Street**

No comments

**894.15211 - the introduction of speed cushions on Wellfield Road and Ashton Street**

Support

- I have no objections to adding speed bumps to reduce traffic speed along Ashton Street and Wellfield Road as this can be an area of speeding concern. Though while these works are in place, this will cut off accessibility to the town centre and worsen traffic conditions so I do have some concerns.
- I fully endorse TRO 2: Speed cushions on Ashton Street & Wellfield Road as this is a no-brainer for safety, especially since the steep downhill section of Wellfield Road is particularly rough.

Objections

- In regards to your second proposal, as a resident of Wellfield Road, I would not say the road is overly busy. Adding speed cushions would not impact the use of our road. I need full access to my car, which is parked in permit parking outside my house, and any changes to where I can drive my vehicle will make my journeys to and from placement very difficult. I understand the need for making Preston more pedestrian friendly, but public transport is not good enough in the city to restrict vehicle movement further.
- Ashton Street and Wellfield Road, have been portrayed as a possible rat run. This is a bus route, with there being a bus stop (Priory Street bus stop), on Ashton Street and one on the other side of the road, near to the junction of Abbey Street. There is also a large industrial estate on Wellfield Road, where HB Panelcraft, amongst others, are based. As such, it is an arterial route, not a rat run. To suggest putting speed humps on this stretch of road is ludicrous. Also, emergency services would need to go over these speed humps if someone on

either road needed an ambulance to transport them to hospital. Someone suffering with a heart attack, stroke or back problems, could find going over a speed hump more painful and potentially more dangerous. I also had a speed hump, outside my previous address on Brackenbury Road, Fulwood. People constantly driving over the speed hump, contributed to my outside walls developing cracks.

- In terms of the proposals for a one-way street and traffic calming measures in the area the position of the residents is that they would like matters to remain the same for the time being. Representations we have received is a concern around the need for accessibility for elderly and disabled residents which potentially would be more difficult if these new schemes are introduced. The residents' position is one that they would like the situation monitored in line with a number of wider changes in the city centre area and if there is an increase danger consider making the change then. At the moment we are unsure what the situation will be following some significant changes to the wider area.

**894.15212 - the removal and introduction of bus stop clearways on Ring Way**

No comments

**894.15213 - (Various Roads, Friargate Area, Preston, Preston City) (Revocation, Prohibition of Driving and One Way Traffic)**

Objection

- We have numerous elderly and disabled patients, who are concerned about the lack of ability to drop off in front of the practice. While there are a number of carparks nearby, feedback from our patients is they don't feel safe or secure using them. Access routes to the practice from these carparks is not suitable for elderly or disabled patients and are not wheelchair friendly. (Note – same comment included in Friargate Moving Orders)

**894.15214 - (Friargate Area, Preston, Preston City) (Revocation and Various Parking Restrictions)**

Objection

- We have numerous elderly and disabled patients, who are concerned about the lack of ability to drop off in front of the practice. While there are a number of carparks nearby feedback from our patients is they don't feel safe or secure using them. Access routes to the practice from these carparks is not suitable for elderly or disabled patients and are not wheelchair friendly. (Note - same comment included in Friargate moving orders)

**894.15215 - The removal of bus stop clearways on Friargate**

No comments

**894.15216 - The removal of a pedestrian crossing on Friargate**

No comments

**894.15217 - (Orchard Street Area, Preston, Preston City) (Revocation, Prohibition of Driving and One Way Traffic)**

No comments

**894.15218 - (Fleet Street, Preston, Preston City) (Revocation and Various parking restrictions)**

Objection

The grounds/reasons I object to this application for the placement of an overnight taxi stand on Fleet St are as follows:

1. All the properties on Fleet St. (with the exception of one property) have all been converted or are currently being converted to full time residential accommodation on all the floors other than ground floors. The noise and disruption which would be caused by the taxi stand/ taxi vehicles from 8pm in the evening to 8am in the morning on a street that is, after 5pm in the evening a predominantly residential street, is ill-conceived.

2. The nearby late night drinking establishments conversely are all around the corner on nearby Lune Street. These being namely 1842 Bar Lune St, The Real Ale House Lune Street, The Angel Public House and late night drinking establishment Lune Street, and finally Perfect 10S Lap Dancing Bar Lune Street.
3. The idea of setting up a taxi rank on a predominantly residential area of Fleet Street, and by doing so bringing the late night revelers from the late night commercial bars of Lune street on to the predominantly residential Fleet Street and the disruption and disturbance that will cause seems unreasonable and illogical to me.
4. The main Preston CCTV system looks directly up and down Lune Street in a north to south direction and so it is much easier to monitor the coming and goings from the bars by a simple North/South view of Lune Street. To then take people out of sight of the camera system from Lune Street to an unmonitored residential side street of Fleet Street would make things much more difficult to monitor.
5. The doormen and night security outside the bars have a clear view up and down Lune Street from each venue on Lune Street in a simple north to south view. To take people away from this view and more importantly control of the doormen around the corner and out of sight to the unmonitored Fleet Street quite simply makes no sense.
6. Again, any police presence on Lune Street in an evening has a clear view in north/south direction of all the bars, and is backed up by the monitored CCTV system. To make life more difficult for the police by placing the proposed new Taxi stand on Fleet Street around a corner and out of view of one line of sight makes no sense.
7. I appreciate there needs to be a relocation of the taxi stand from Friargate but would respectfully suggest it be placed on Lune Street itself (a much more commercial than residential street), south of the Angel bar and Tens bars - in front of St Georges Shopping Centre entrance/ below the multistory car park. If positioned there, it is in the line of sight and easily monitored by the security/doormen on Lune Street; it is easily monitored by the police on Lune Street; it can be monitored by the CCTV system on Lune Street.
8. Finally, there was an application previously by Preston City council to sight a Taxi rank/ stand on Fleet Street in 2009 (Reference LAS/MRT/FD). The application was rejected and refused approval by Lancashire County Councilors back in 2009 due to the grounds set out above.

**894.15271 - The removal of bus stop clearways on Friargate**

No Comments

**894.15646 - (Friargate North Area, Preston, Preston City) (20mph Speed Limit)**

Support

- The proposed 20mph speed limit will make the centre of Preston much friendlier to pedestrians and so encourage more footfall traffic along Friargate thus increasing business. Preston would also become a more coherent city with Friargate and UCLan becoming better connected to the rest of the centre now that the A59 will no longer be cutting quite so decisively through the centre of town.

**894.15647 - The introduction of pedestrian (zebra) crossings of the cycle track on Ring Way**

No comments

**Scheme general – not referring to a specific order**

Support

- As a resident in Fulwood I believe the current plans for the city centre will improve Preston significantly by encouraging people to walk and bike instead of relying on cars to travel. The current infrastructure is unsafe and unsightly which results in fewer cyclists and pedestrians.

Objection

- As the bike path becomes finalised I can see it's been designed wrong. There's a new accident blackspot going to be created. I believe cyclist injuries and death are going to increase by

adding the bike path to Ringway. Previously the traffic lights at Friargate/Ringway caused a natural stopping of cars so you could cross Friargate on the footpath northern edge of Ringway. The end of Friargate is being pedestrianised so traffic, particularly takeaway delivery drivers aiming to pick-up at the southern end of Friargate will be going east on Ringway, left at Market St West then onto Friargate, and similarly with those leaving Friargate will go onto Ringway at Market St West. You've placed a bike path at this spot, any cyclist going west on the new bike path will be going downhill, so at speed, the cyclist will be able to easily see a car on Market St West southbound via glancing right, but will be surprised by a car on Ringway eastbound who turns north into Market St West as that turn is immediately at the bike path.

**Opening of Maudland Bank to Fylde Road - not proposed within the scheme or a TRO consultation item**

Comments received

- We strongly oppose about opening Maudland Bank for traffic and lorries, buses and coaches.
- Firstly, I want to be assured that there is not, nor will there be in the future, a plan to remove the bollards that block off the bottom of Maudland Bank the other side of which leads to Fylde Road. Whilst the consultation does not include this suggestion I have spoken to my relevant councillors (cc'd) and let them know that there is a view amongst the residents that this may be the longer-term strategy. We fought long and hard to have this put in place for reasons of safety and to address concerns with pollution, as Maudland Bank was used as a cut through and became a rat run for speeding vehicles.
- There MUST be no proposals to revisit the removal of the cut off at the bottom of Maudland Bank onto Fylde Road. Whilst the consultation remains quiet on this matter (and it is my understanding it may be considered at a later stage) I feel the need to re-iterate residents' views on this matter which I support.
- Also, a number of residents are concerned that this proposal and collateral problems will lead to a future proposal the open Maudland Bank to through traffic, by removing the barrier between its junctions with Tuson Drive and Peel Street. The barrier was constructed in August 2001, following a 5-year campaign by residents over road safety concerns as Leighton Street and Maudland Bank was being used as a rat-run, in both directions, between Marsh Lane and Fylde Road.