
Meeting: Traffic Management Meeting
Date: 3 May 2017
Subject: **Stuart Street and Union Street, Dunstable – Consider Objections to Parking Restriction Proposals**
Report of: Paul Mason, Assistant Director Highways
Summary: This report seeks the approval of the Executive Member for Community Services for the implementation of waiting restrictions in Stuart Street and Union Street, Dunstable

RECOMMENDATION:-

That the proposals be implemented as published, but nos. 58, 58a, 60, 62 and 64 Union Street be added to the list of residencies eligible to apply for a permit to park in Stuart Street.

Contact Officer: Gary Baldwin
gary.baldwin@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: Dunstable Central and Dunstable Northfields
Function of: Council

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Council Priorities:

The proposal will improve road safety, traffic management and the amenity in the affected road.

Financial:

The works are being funded by the Minor Traffic Management schemes budget.

Legal:

None from this report.

Risk Management:

None from this report.

Staffing (including Trades Unions):

None from this report.

Equalities/Human Rights:

None from this report.

Community Safety:

None from this report.

Sustainability:

None from this report.

Budget and Delivery:	
Estimated cost: £4,000	Budget: Minor TM schemes
Expected delivery: July 2017	

Background and Information

1. The Council has received a number of complaints from members of the public, and Ward Members about parking in Stuart Street, Dunstable. Many properties have no off-street parking and kerbside space is at a premium. There appear to be a number of vehicles, including commercial vans, parking in Stuart Street, which do not belong to residents of that street.
2. A preliminary consultation was carried out involving residents of both Stuart Street and Clifton Road, the results of which were as follows:-

Stuart Street

A total of 12 replies from the 21 homes were received, which is 57%. 10 of those who replied would support a residents' permit scheme and 2 were undecided. Hence, 83% of respondents and 48% of the whole street would support a residents permit parking scheme.

Clifton Road

This was included in the consultation, as any parking scheme in Stuart Street is likely to have an impact in Clifton Road. A total of 13 replies from the 57 homes were received, which is 23%. 5 of those who replied would support a residents' permit scheme, 6 were opposed and 2 were undecided. Hence, 38% of respondents and 9% of the whole street would support a residents permit parking scheme.

As a result it was decided to proceed with publishing a residents permit parking scheme in Stuart Street, but not in Clifton Road.

3. After carrying out the initial consultation exercise, the Council became aware of concerns surrounding parking in Union Street. Residents of a row of houses located close to Stuart Street have double yellow lines to the front of their properties and use Stuart Street for parking. Their concern was that if the permit parking scheme goes ahead they will not be able to park in Stuart Street and would have nowhere to park. It was felt that a length of the yellow lines in front of the houses was not essential, so could be removed to provide some parking for adjacent residents. In addition, a business on the corner of Union Street and Stuart Street expressed concerns about the lack of parking for customers.
4. As a result, it was decided to publish a proposal for resident permit parking in Stuart Street. It was also decided to include the removal of the unnecessary yellow lines in Union Street together with a short length of 30 minutes limited waiting in that road in an attempt to satisfy the various demands.
5. The proposals were formally advertised by public notice in February 2017. Consultations were carried out with the emergency services and other statutory bodies, Dunstable Town Council and the Ward Members. Residents and businesses located in the areas where restrictions are proposed were individually consulted by letter and notices were posted on street.

Representations and Officer Responses

4. A total of 4 objections were received in response to the proposals. One of those relates to the impact that the proposal will have on Clifton Road and the remainder relate to the Union Street issue. Copies are included in Appendix C. In January 2017 a petition, signed by 13 people, was received in relation to parking and road safety in Union Street. This has been included in this report as the parking concerns mirror the objections raised.
5. Clifton Road objection
The main points of the objection are:-
 - a) It is already difficult to find parking in Clifton Road and making Stuart Street residents parking only will make it worse.
 - b) Residents of Stuart Street will park in Clifton Road to avoid buying a permit, thereby taking up spaces.
 - c) The partial one-way system in Clifton Road means that the two-way section, in which the objector lives, is more heavily parked up.
 - d) The proposed double yellow lines will reduce the number of spaces even further.
6. Officer response:-
 - a) Parking appears to be less heavy in Clifton Road than in Stuart Street, so there is some spare capacity. The response to the initial consultation suggested that many residents of Clifton Road are not that concerned about parking in their road. However, the matter will be kept under review if permit parking in Stuart Street is implemented and if problems develop and there is local support, further parking controls could be considered.

- b) There is a possibility that this may happen and will need to be monitored.
- c) That point is accepted.
- d) The proposed double yellow lines cover a minimal length at the Clifton Road/ Stuart Street junction, which are areas where drivers should not be parked as advised in the Highway Code.

7. Union Street objections

The main points of the objections are:-

- a) The four properties currently have no on-street or off-street parking available, so rely on parking in Stuart Street. There are rarely parking spaces available in Union Street.
- b) The removal of the double yellow lines in Union Street will move the current problems from Stuart Street to that length of Union Street, including the potential for parking by commercial vehicles.
- c) The four houses directly affected are unique in that they are surrounded by properties that have off-street parking and are within walking distance of the town centre.
- d) Can the proposed permit parking scheme in Stuart Street be operational during the working day only rather than at all times?
- e) If implemented can the start of the residents permit scheme be set back into Stuart Street to leave some unrestricted spaces near Union Street?
- f) Is it possible to include the four houses in the Stuart Street permit scheme?
- g) Could the length of removed double yellow lines become permit holder parking?
- h) The Council should look at the remainder of Union Street and consider the removal of more unnecessary yellow lines.
- i) The petition appeals for traffic calming measures to address road safety concerns on this stretch of Union Street.

Officer response:-

- a) These properties appear to have no parking immediately available, but that is not uncommon in town centre streets. In these situations, parking is frequently heavy during evenings and weekends and residents struggle to find parking close to their homes.
- b) It is accepted that there may be some transference of parking. The focus of the Council's proposal was Stuart Street. The Union Street elements were added to the proposal in an attempt to increase spaces in Union Street to help those residents directly affected.
- c) It is accepted that there are significant pressures on parking in this area of Dunstable.
- d) The preliminary consultation indicated that Stuart Street residents experience problems on all days of the week and at all times, so a 24/7 scheme was felt to be appropriate. Residents of Stuart Street have raised no concerns about this.

- e) This would leave unrestricted spaces that are likely to be treated in a similar way to the additional spaces that would be created in Union Street, so would achieve very little.
 - f) The proposal could be amended to include these properties, but other residents of Union Street may ask for similar treatment. There could also be some opposition from residents Stuart Street as this will take away valuable spaces from them.
 - g) It would be possible to create permit holder bays where the yellow lines are proposed to be removed. However, this would require the proposal to be re-published and consultation repeated. Other Union Street residents may expect to be able to apply for permits to park on that length of road and/or there could well be requests to look at resident permit parking in the remainder of Union Street.
 - h) This could form part of a wider parking consultation in Union Street.
 - i) This is outside the scope of the parking scheme and needs to be considered as a separate issue. The request would need to be prioritised alongside other requests for traffic and safety improvements in Central Bedfordshire.
9. There does appear to be some justification for considering changes to the proposals to accommodate the concerns of the residents of Union Street and the options are:-
- (i) Implement the proposals as published.
 - (ii) Implement the proposals as published, but include the small number of Union Street residencies in the list of those eligible to apply for a permit to park in Stuart Street. This is a minor change that could be included without the need to re-publish the proposal. This could be an interim arrangement pending a wider review of parking in Union Street.
 - (iii) As (ii) but leave the double yellow lines in place in Union Street.
 - (iv) Add permit holder parking spaces in the length of road subject to the removal of the double yellow lines and add those properties to the Stuart Street permit eligibility list. This would mean that both Stuart Street and Union Street permit holders could use designated spaces in either street. This would mean that the proposal would need to be re-published.
 - (v) Defer a decision on the whole proposal pending a wider review of parking in Union Street.
10. It is recommended that option (ii) be chosen as this would address the original objective of tackling parking issues in Stuart Street and would assist the small number of residents of Union Street directly affected. Any subsequent parking study would need to be undertaken after the restrictions have been implemented and parking patterns settled for several months to highlight any parking problems created, including Clifton Road, if deemed necessary.
11. If approved and implemented, the restrictions will be implemented in July 2017. The restrictions will be reviewed after 5 years to determine whether they should be retained, modified or removed.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Public notice of proposals

Appendix B – Drawing of proposals

Appendix C – Representations

Appendix D – Union Street petition



PUBLIC NOTICE

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL PROPOSES TO INTRODUCE RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING AND NO WAITING AT ANY TIME IN STUART STREET AND CLIFTON ROAD, DUNSTABLE AND TO REMOVE LENGTHS OF NO WAITING AT ANY TIME AND INTRODUCE 30 MINUTE LIMITED WAITING IN UNION STREET, DUNSTABLE

Reason for proposal: The permit parking is intended to address non-resident parking and to help residents, many of which have little or no off-street parking, to be able to park in their street. The proposed no waiting at any time is intended to ensure that the junctions at both ends of Stuart Street remain clear of parked vehicles. The proposed 30 minute limited waiting is intended to provide short stay parking for adjacent businesses. The length of no waiting at any time in Union Street is considered to be unnecessary and its removal will provide valuable parking space.

Effect of the Order:

To introduce Parking for Resident Permit Holders only on the following length of road in Dunstable:-

1. Stuart Street, from a point 4 metres north-west of the front wall of no.66 Union Street extending in a north-westerly direction to a point in line with the front wall of no.37 Clifton Road.

To introduce No Waiting at any time on the following lengths of road in Dunstable:-

1. Stuart Street, both sides, from its junction with Union Street extending in a north-westerly direction to a point approximately 4 metres north-west of the front wall of no.66 Union Street.
2. Stuart Street, both sides, from its junction with Clifton Road extending in a south-easterly direction to a point in line with the front wall of no.37 Clifton Road.
3. Clifton Road, south-east side, from a point in line with the south-west flank wall of no.37 Clifton Road extending in a south-westerly direction for approximately 15 metres.

To remove the existing No Waiting at any time and introduce 30 minutes Limited Waiting with

No Return within 1 hour from 8am to 10pm on the following length of road in Dunstable:-

1. Union Street, north-west side, from a point approximately 2 metres north-east of the boundary of nos.68 and 70 Union Street extending in a south-westerly direction for approximately 15 metres.

To remove the existing No Waiting at any time on the following length of road in Dunstable:-

1. Union Street, north-west side, from a point approximately 2 metres south-west of the boundary of nos.64 and 66 Union Street extending in a north-easterly direction for approximately 32 metres.

Further Details may be examined during normal office hours at the address shown below, viewed online at www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicstatutorynotices or tel. 0300 300 5003.

Comments should be sent in writing to the Traffic Management team at the address below or e-mail traffic.consultation@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk by 21 March 2017. Any objections must state the grounds on which they are made.

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

Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House
Chicksands
Shefford SG17 5TQ

Marcel Coiffait
Director of Community Services

23 February 2017

Appendix B



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey 100049029

Appendix C

I reside at number xx Clifton Road, Dunstable. Unfortunately I was unable to take part in your preliminary consultation regarding On-Street parking at Clifton road due to being away traveling on business.

We were delighted that Central Bedfordshire Council's proposal to introduce residents permit parking down Clifton road, since it is currently a nightmare to park.

However we are really disappointed that Stuart Street has been granted the permit scheme and excluded Clifton road. Therefore we strongly objected resident parking permit scheme being introduced to Stuart Street residents only due to below reasons.

1 – I own one car and already I find it very difficult to park down Clifton road and we have to park in a neighbouring street due to non residents invading our parking spaces. Giving Stuart Street permit parking will make matters worse.

2 – Residents who own more than 1 vehicle on Stuart Street will try to conveniently park on Clifton road once this scheme is introduced.

3 – As you know $\frac{3}{4}$ length of Clifton road is ONE WAY. therefore whoever is looking to park will not drive back down the A5 to come back up the one way system to find parking. It is always to the two way part of Clifton road that gets affected.

4 – Your proposed “No Waiting at any time” demarcations will also reduce the number parking spaces.

5 - We feel the residents living down the two way part of Clifton road are badly affected by this proposal.

I have two children and it is very disappointing that we are currently unable to park down our own street and have to find parking in other streets.

Due to above reasons I strongly object to Stuart Street having resident parking.

Our objections and comments regarding the above consultation:

We feel we have no option other than to object to the whole proposal on the basis that if it is implemented the consequences will just make a bad situation intolerable. I fully understand that the residents of Stuart Street have had enough of the casual parking by office workers and shoppers in their street however to deny us access to Stuart Street and offer us the sop of removing the double yellow lines outside our houses will hardly help. Removing the double yellow lines outside our houses will simply remove the problem parkers from Stuart Street into this stretch of Union Street and leave us in a worse situation than the one we already experience.

Our neighbours in Stuart Street were well aware of the difficulties their application would cause us and were hugely sympathetic, perhaps it could have been suggested at that stage that these 3 houses could be included in the scheme, I believe there would not have been any objection as we would not be parking directly outside their properties. Certainly Councillors Hegley, Young and Ghent could see no reason why that should not be the case.

These 3 houses are quite unique, we are surrounded by properties that have off street parking and we are at the extremities of the town centre at a distance which is just convenient to park and walk for those people who choose not to pay to use the public car parks. We have a petition which we believe is

to be discussed at the 24th March Traffic Management Meeting asking for permit parking in this part of Union Street, however I am not encouraged by the remark at the councillors surgery that it was unlikely to be accepted as the whole of Union Street would need to be consulted and there was no appetite for it from those residents at the top end of the street who do not have any real difficulty at present as they would not be keen to pay for permits. On that basis and without any provision for us in Stuart Street we have to object to the removal of the yellow lines.

As the residents of Stuart Street are complaining about office workers etc. why can the permit parking just be operational between the hours of 9am and 6pm Monday to Friday instead of at all times as proposed.

In the event of Stuart Street getting permit parking scheme that we are not included in, we would have to accept the lines on Union Street being removed as our only chance of parking. Therefore, can we at least propose that the permit parking application in Stuart Street be amended to commence at the boundary of numbers 2 and 3 this would allow us some parking if the yellow lines are removed and the stretch outside our houses is full, there is a natural break in this part of the street as the kerbs are dropped at 66 Union Street for access to the car park and at 68 Union Street for access to the garage.

It would help the whole area if the council looked at all the removal of excessive double yellow lines in the whole of Union Street and not just those in the stretch outside our houses.

On a personal note – I cannot stress strongly enough the effects these proposals have on myself and my neighbours. I should not have to be awake half the night worrying about the consequences of this whole situation, we have invested a lot of time, money and love turning a rundown terraced house into a home which will work for us in our REALLY old age, we should not be considering the idea of moving house, we are both retired and do not have the luxury of being able to add to savings we would need to use in order to make that move. So we are faced with the prospect of driving around the area trying to find a place to park somewhere near our home and looking forward to the day we need to ask the council to provide us with a disabled parking bay outside the house. We are already stressed when we use the car in case we cannot find a parking space when we return home the prospects for the future if the scheme is implemented without change does not bear thinking about.

Further to my e-mail of 16/3.

I have noticed that the traffic wardens are now enforcing permit parking in the Prince Regent area. As the South East side of Union Street - High Street North to Princes Street is part of this area I believe this will add to our problems. Those workers who park on that side of Union Street, the residents of the Prince Regent scheme who do not have a second car permit or are unable to find a space will also look to park in front of our homes. It seems ironic that in trying to provide parking for these three houses the council has potentially left us with a bigger problem than the one we already encounter. A resident from any of the parking zones that surround us will be able to park in any of the spaces created outside our homes whilst we are barred from using their streets.

I live in one of 3 houses on Union Street (no's xx, xx and xx) just along from the Motor Shop close to the corner of Stuart Street. **We don't have either on-street or off-street parking.** It's very rare we get to park on Union Street near our homes where parking is unrestricted, as those spaces are filled by non-residents and local business vehicles due to the closeness to the town centre and displacement from the Prince Regent scheme. For many years we have relied on parking in Stuart Street at the Union Street end. Houses on that road don't start till quite far down, so historically there's been plenty of space for our cars. In recent years even this has become harder and harder- for the reasons that have lead the residents of Stuart Street to apply for this scheme.

My main points are:

- If we agree to the scheme in its current form, including the removal of the double yellow lines, we will inherit Stuart Street's non-resident parking problem. The length of unrestricted parking created won't even be equal to the length of road currently available on Stuart Street during the day, and as Union Street is a through road, it will attract even more non-resident parkers due to the closeness to the town centre and the spaces being easier to spot. Our front windows are 1.5 meters from the curb-side. Unrestricted parking could affect us very badly, both leaving us with no parking ourselves but also the possibility of large vehicles parking indefinitely, directly outside our houses. This would block out light, but also I'm worried about large diesel vehicles running their engines so close to the house- this is something I was already concerned about as customers of the Motor Shop often rev their engines on the street outside and you can smell the fumes in our front room.
- Objecting to the just removal of the lines is not an option, as that would leave us with nowhere to park at all if the residents parking scheme is implemented.
- **We would have no objection to Stuart Street achieving residents parking if our 3 houses can be included in the scheme.** We live in very close proximity to Stuart Street and currently depend on it for parking. We are in a unique situation to the rest of Union Street as we currently have no parking in any form. Other residents that park on the road in Union Street are much further away, and are unlikely to want to pay for permits to park in Stuart Street and it seems unfair to deny us the possibility of being included in the permit scheme on the basis that it would be unfair to other Union Street residents . Please refer to my document illustrating this point supplied to Gary Baldwin and Nigel Young on the 7th March 2017.
- We have a request currently being processed for a simple scheme at our end of Union Street, adding some traffic calming and giving us some permit spaces where there are currently double yellow lines. If, as Gary Baldwin suggests, it were opened up to the whole of Union Street, it's very likely to be objected to by a majority, as the residents at the top end of Union Street are much further from town, and already have on-street parking. Many won't want to pay for what they already have free. Again, please refer to the aforementioned document which illustrates this point.

The outcome of this proposal is crucial to us, and we desperately need a resolution that gives us, in these 3 houses, some specific/exceptional consideration.

I am a resident of Union Street Dunstable, in a small row of houses opposite the Edward Street junction; outside of which you propose to remove the length of no waiting at any time.

In order to state the grounds on which my objection is made, I must point out that the grounds on which this part of your proposal is made, are unclear and could be considered irrelevant to your desire to 'pacify' Stuart Street residents. I believe I deserve an explanation as to why the no waiting at any time on Union Street has been deemed 'unnecessary'.

I would also like to know why it is acceptable to prevent people such as myself and my neighbours from parking on Stuart Street, yet it is entirely acceptable to allow anyone and everyone to park outside our houses? Tell me, where are we supposed to park? If your primary reason for the proposal is to help Stuart Street residents with parking solutions, why are we few Union Street residents not afforded the same courtesy?

Second to your proposal being unclear, my main objection to this proposal is the way in which it discriminates the row of houses to which we belong (numbers 60-64 Union Street).

If this proposal goes ahead, we will have the distinction of being the only losers in this situation.

1. We are at risk of being excluded from one of the only places where we can currently park (there are seldom parking spaces available on Union Street parallel to the flats of Sandland Close because it is not for permit holders only).

2. We are not being given the opportunity to have our own length of residents only parking.

This proposal benefits:

1. Stuart Street residents.
2. Local businesses.
3. The general public.

Now I understand it might thrill you to please three groups of stakeholders all in one go, but this proves my point, that you are discriminating against number 60-64 Union Street. I really feel I deserve an explanation as to why this is.

Desired solutions would be:

1. A stretch of permit holder parking bays outside of our houses.
2. Failing that, the opportunity to purchase permits to park on Stuart Street and for the no waiting at any time on Union Street to REMAIN in place. If residents are not granted the right to a permit to park immediately outside their own house, then it is unjust that anyone else should be able to, therefore the double yellow lines are necessary.

To quote your own document 'The permit parking is intended to **address non-resident parking and to help residents**, many of which have **little or no off-street parking, to be able to park in their street**'. This is precisely our predicament on Union Street also, and it would be discriminatory not to help us find a solution.

I hope my thoughts will be considered, and I hope that my residency and council tax payments are valued the same as everybody else's.

Appendix D

Petition for allocated parking & the removal of double yellow lines in one area of Union Street to help alleviate the parking of cars in neighbouring roads

NAME	Address	Signature
------	---------	-----------



Request ref: 101000054803

I'm representing the residents that live in the small line of terraced houses connected to the motor shop. This document is primarily a petition for the removal of double yellow lines and allocated resident parking.

Here are details of what we would like to request:

We have a few issues with the road as follows:

- Firstly as we have double yellow lines outside our house, we have to rely on parking either in Stuart Street or further down Union Street, as the years have gone by this has become harder and harder as people park all around this area to walk into town, making it impossible sometimes to find any place to park close by. A feeling of hostility has built up in the neighbouring streets, we have had our cars targeted for vandalism (tyres punctured, paintwork scratched) & verbal abuse. We find ourselves regularly in a situation of not being able to park near our homes, and when we do park our cars at a distance, might return to the cars and find them damaged.
- Secondly traffic builds up speed at this point along the road, because unlike the top and bottom of Union Street, the road is clear of parked cars and is very wide, we have cars racing up the road at top speed, sometimes in the night, and also very noisy motorbikes (the motor bike repair shop is on Regents Street).
- Thirdly, there is a right turn feeder lane in front of our homes which actively encourages traffic to maintain speed and pass cars turning right, which they do dangerously close to the pavement. There are schools in the area as well as being a main pedestrian route towards the town centre so

mothers and children are regularly trying to cross the road often at the time when the traffic is at its busiest using Union Street as a cut-through.

The request (ref:54803) I have made to the council is a combination of things that I hope might help resolve these issues:

Proposed Solution

To remove some yellow lines on the North-West side of Union street and replace with 8 -10 nominated permit holder spaces for house numbers 58a & b, 60, 62 & 64. To add some traffic calming, and remove the feeder lane in front of our house. See figure 1.

Ideally we'd like parking permit spaces that incorporate traffic calming in the form of a raised crossing point. I have seen these in other places around Dunstable.- I have included some pictures of Princes Street and Gr Northern Rd, but there are many other examples. See fig 2. Union Street is 3 lanes wide, so I can't see why a lot of the yellow lines are there (I have included comparative road measurements on page 3. Historically the double yellows in front of our house were there to accommodate lorries turning on route to a frozen food factory that was located near-by, but that business has been gone for over 10 years now.

Contents of this document

Page 1 Written request and details

Page 2 Ariel view of area including and illustration of requested changes, and similar existing highway solutions in the surrounding areas.

Page 3 Photographs of similar highway solutions on similar Streets, and road width measurements.

Page 4 Benefits to local residents

Problem Area



Figure 1: Ariel view with proposed changes included.



Examples of proposed road markings and traffic calming in a similar area or situation to Union Street



Road widths:

Union Street	7.9m
Chiltern Road	7.2
Gr Northern Street	7m

Figure 2



Benefits to local residents:

Parking: People living in Stuart Street will have more available parking- My neighbours and I account for at least 7-9 cars at various times needing to park on Stuart and Clifton Roads- the Motor Shop customers would also have more space to park in Stuart Street. The problem we have with people parking to walk into town will be resolved. Our homes face right onto the street (no front garden) being able to park our cars out front will act as a buffer from the road. Also there are many times we needed to park outside our house to load the car or when I have visits from my elderly relatives- each time we risk a parking ticket.

Safety: The feeder lane and generous width of the street in front of our house encourages cars to pick up speed. Traffic needs to be slowed from the point of view of noise pollution; we have cars and motor bikes, particularly at night speeding past our house. Also there are many schools in the vicinity and lots of pedestrians needing to cross at peak times. Having three lanes of moving traffic on what is predominantly a residential road is unsuitable and at worse dangerous.

I have been told in the past that there needs to be double yellows opposite a junction- I have found many examples where this is not the case- some photos below.

