

LOCATION	RECEIVED FROM	RESPONSE
South Road, Kirkby Stephen.	Resident	Support - 'I am very pleased with your proposals... I/we feel that the double yellow lines should extend more into Croglam Lane allowing access to firbrigade and ambulance. May I/we suggest that some Highways CCTV camera is installed to make sure that law is enforced as there seems to be no policing'. <i>(Officer comment - the scope of the scheme does not extend to cover Croglam Lane, CCC Highways is not aware of parking issues at this location. CCTV cameras could not be used for this purpose).</i>
South Road, Kirkby Stephen.	Resident.	Request additional - 'I am allowed to park on the pavement in front of my house, but often have difficulty getting out with people parking either on the pavement or with 2 wheels on the pavement. At each side the pavement of me the pavement drops down for access, but these are also blocked with the result anyone in a wheelchair or on a buggy can't get access and I can't get off either. I would be obliged if you would review this and maybe have some yellow lines over one of the access points'. <i>(Officer comment - this refers to the section of footway opposite Manor Court. The resident making the request, from what I understand, is parking on the footway and not private property off the highway. The residents whose accesses are made reference to have not requested that their access be subject to restriction).</i>
South Road, Kirkby Stephen.	Resident.	Support - Further to the letter dated 13th September 2018 I would like to suggest that an extended waiting area adjacent to "Boroughs Entrance" the small road that splits High Street and South Road is considered. I use this road to access the A685 on a daily basis and the visibility of traffic moving in both directions is very limited due to the proximity of parked cars. The addition of an extended waiting area at this location will be of benefit to traffic awareness when using this junction. <i>(Officer comment - the proposal replicates the existing advisory road markings. Extension of the proposed restrictions (the junction to the south west of Manor Court, between South Road and Croglam lane) is a reasonable request. One space for parking one car would be lost to benefit visibility for vehicles emerging from this junction).</i>
South Road, Kirkby Stephen.	Resident.	My house together with my neighbour, will be unable to park outside our respective homes. Parking along the road towards town is already taken by those residents, so no overflow could be accommodated there. I am an OAP and my neighbour is a care worker on call, we both need to access our vehicles easily. All the remaining planned restrictions on the west side of the street around this area are, obviously, placed where there are small access points between houses. There is no such access point near our premises so this unfairly discriminates against us as there is no valid reason for this small stretch of yellow lining. Furthermore, at this section of the road the parking does not impede the two-way flow of traffic. I therefore suggest you do not fix that which is not broken. Allow our continued parking in front of our homes. Parking along South Road is always respectful, considerate and polite; the larger properties to the South West are unlikely to have vehicles block their access as their driveways are quite obvious so these do not need restricting. <i>(Officer comment - The length of restriction in question does commence at/cover a vehicle access but is a point where the road widens. Removal of this length of restriction from the proposal would not foreseeably have a significant negative effect on the scheme - Recommend that this length (outside the property Rowan Cottage) be removed from the proposal).</i>
South Road, Kirkby Stephen.	Resident.	Objection - 'There are several points I would like to raise: - the proposed plan for south South Road will make very little difference to traffic flow and vehicle conflict because nobody waits/parks in the areas proposed (as you say, a continuation of existing informal arrangements) - there is an apparent HGV ban through Kirkby Stephen (not policed) so I'm wandering why provision is being made for HGV's in the plan Can I make the suggestion that parking bays on the southern part of South Road are fully placed on the road. This will prevent the constant damage to parked vehicles from passing traffic trying to squeeze past each other. There isn't the room for two cars to pass each other safely with cars parked half on and half off the pavement and yet the current parking arrangements make drivers take the risk of damaging other people's vehicles... I'd also like to suggest that the HGV ban is policed. I moved to Kirkby Stephen five years ago with the mistaken belief that there is an HGV ban.' <i>(Officer comment - Restrictions would deter inappropriate/inconsiderate parking at the locations where they are proposed and more easily allow for action to be taken, if necessary. Regular, easily identifiable locations that allow passing would, at worst, maintain the current situation. The A685 is subject to an 18 tonne weight restriction with exceptions for permit holders, access and vehicles carrying livestock, between Brough and Tebay. A number of HGVs have legitimate business throughout the A685 corridor and as such must be considered during the design of any highways scheme. Both fully on carriageway and partially on the footway parking places were given consideration during design. Unfortunately, the carriageway and footways along the southern section of South Road are little over the minimum widths that would be expected for the class of road. Cumbria County Council Highways could not introduce parking places while conforming to national standards and legislation.)</i>
All Kirkby Stephen proposals.	Town Council	Support all proposals with some comments; South Road -The restriction outside numbers 30-34 South Road appears to be unnecessary. There is no entrance here to the rear of these properties. Will these additional restrictions require posts to be installed with parking restriction information? If so that will add further clutter to the public realm. Could the short lengths be marked as "Keep Clear" rather than double yellow lines – probably just as effective with the levels of enforcement we are likely to see. <i>(Officer comment - agree that this particular length of restrictions should be deleted from proposal). No additional sigs would be required for 'No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions).</i> North Road - I approve of the short duration zone outside the chemists. The current parking marks taper towards the Market Square end. If this taper is removed as proposed there may be problems when Steadman's butchers get deliveries. However it is only normalising current practice. <i>(Officer comment – remaining road width would be in excess of 6m, suitable for two way traffic).</i> Station Road - appear to be acceptable. The continuous restriction on the East side is sensible as it follows the status quo. I note the short lengths of restriction seem to be associated with entrances which need to be kept clear, although how much these are used I don't know.

Station Road, Kirkby Stephen.	Resident	<p>Object - The Highway Code restricts parking within 10 meters of a junction, this is regularly broken at this junction; however we've have never seen this enforced. The map is old and therefore we're unsure how far along Station Road the restrictions would apply, it appears to go past Stenkrith House to the start of Darnell Cottage, if this is the case then we will be unable to park outside our home.</p> <p>In the 6 years we've lived at Stenkrith House there have been no accidents to our knowledge</p> <p>In our opinion the main issue at this junction is that due to the width of the junction entrance we see vehicles regularly turn off Nateby Road onto Station Road in excess of 20mph, these restrictions will do nothing to stop this</p> <p>I would therefore like to formally object to the proposed restrictions at the junction of Nateby and Station Roads.</p> <p>Could we propose that a reasonable compromise would be for the restrictions to enforce the Highway Code of 10 meters, this would stop the irresponsible parking while allowing us to park outside our home. <i>(Officer comment - The Highway Code is not in itself enforceable, though police officers may consider that the offence of obstruction of the highway has been committed, in contravention of The Highways Act 1980. The proposed No Waiting at Any Time restrictions would extend approx. 15m from the junction, terminating within three meters of the building line of Stenkrith House. The objector would still be able to park outside their property.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed restrictions are intended to keep the junction clear of obstruction. The objector is correct in stating there have been no recorded collisions in the previous six years. These restrictions are unlikely to have any impact on traffic speeds but will only help maintain unimpeded traffic flow at the junction).</i></p>
Station Road, Kirkby Stephen.	Resident	<p>Support - request extension of restrictions - 'My concern is where the yellow lines end on Station Road, as there are approx.5 or 6 vehicles use the entrance to The Cottons and 1,2,3 Quarry Close and the same amount use entrance for Stenkrith House, High Ledge House and DARNELL COTTAGE which are direct opposite. Would it be possible to extend the waiting restrictions about 10 - 12 metres past these entrances? <i>(Officer comment - the introduction of restrictions may exasperate the issues described if not extended as requested. Recommend extending the proposed restrictions as requested).</i></p>
Station Road, Kirkby Stephen.	Town Council	<p>Support - The Station Road junctions appear to be acceptable. The continuous restriction on the East side is sensible as it follows the status quo. I note the short lengths of restriction seem to be associated with entrances which need to be kept clear, although how much these are used I don't know.</p>
Hobsons Lane, Kirkby Stephen.	Resident	<p>Support - 'I thank you very much for your letter regarding no waiting at Hobsons Lane/Redmayne Road... I am very much in favour of your suggestion'</p>
Hackthorpe	Resident	<p>Support - I fully agree with the proposed restrictions. As indicated in your letter, larger vehicles have difficulty in negotiating the junction due to several vehicles being parked along the roadside, the problem is more evident for all vehicles at school drop off and pick up times, and also with the increase in traffic going to and coming from Lowther Castle. There is an adequate parking place at the village hall for all concerned, obviously they are too lazy to walk the extra distance but remain oblivious to the hazards they are creating.</p>
Hackthorpe	School	<p>I totally understand your need to change the situation on the road outside and along from school. Parking is always a problem near school and I am aware that staff from both our school and the Nursery park there as well as drop offs from parents.</p> <p>However, for my staff's safety, if they are expected to park in the village hall carpark – this is the only alternative, which does have adequate parking for us all, then the issue of extensive lighting will have to be addressed.</p> <p>Staff arrive in the dark (for breakfast club) and leave in the dark in the autumn and winter months. It is so dark outside the school that you cannot see your feet or hands, let alone walk to the carpark. It can be quite a frightening experience both being in the dark and fear of someone waiting there.</p> <p>Please do, when considering your proposal, visit the area during these times to understand this. <i>(Officer comment - a reduced length of restriction on the north side of the U3179 would protect the junction and maintain traffic flow while still allowing some parking. TTh lighting issue described is located on private/Parish Land).</i></p>
Hackthorpe	Resident	<p>Object - There is little information in your letter. What does larger vehicles negotiating the junction mean? I watched a full size council truck towing an equivalent diameter trailer drive straight through past the school, last week, without hesitation, with cars parked all along the Orchard House side. So there is plenty of room.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One conflict is probably school drop-off and pick-up times, in which case, as with any school, parents should have priority and trucks should either be briefed to go another way or be patient. I can't imagine many parents obeying double yellow line rules when dropping off their kids.</li> <li>• Another conflict may be the large number of trucks on the build-up to Kendal Calling and Lowther Show - the same should apply. But this is a very short period of a whole year. The community should have priority.</li> <li>• Another conflict seems to be access to the driveways of 2-3 houses on that stretch, with difficulties for vehicles such as oil delivery trucks on an occasional basis. Cars tend to be parked there on school days during working hours ... these seem to be school staff and the staff at the day care centre on the A6. This would be very much a problem for residents, in which case, something needs to change.</li> <li>• That stretch of road is useful for parking when we have visitors</li> </ul> <p>Whilst for some, the issue seems to need addressing, 'no waiting at any time' restrictions are ridiculous. The issues occur at certain times, of certain days, at specific points on your map. Why, therefore, do you need to deprive the community of this facility for 24 hours a day, every day of the year. If people are inconvenienced for some of the time, apply the restrictions for those times. <i>(Officer comment- much of the conflict does occur at school start and end times. All highway users are obliged to observe restrictions or face penalties. All highway users have equal right. The problem is worsened when large events are taking place. The highway being passable to takes priority over parking availability. Introduction of 'time of day' restrictions suggest that it is appropriate/acceptable to park at those locations when restrictions are not active, this is not the case in this instance).</i></p>

A689/B5277, Alston.	Resident	<p>Object - I know we have been here before with this proposal, exactly a year ago, and I object now as I did before. It's a short sighted proposal which does not consider the bigger picture of increased car ownership in a small town simply not built for lots of motor vehicles. Any changes proposed should consider that context first and foremost and the aim should be to find a longer term strategic solution to the problem, rather than slapping down double yellows everywhere. you simply cannot displace parking spaces for circa 18 properties reliant on street parking without proposing an alternative. It might be solving the problem for the (very) small handful of larger vehicles wishing to make a left turn at the A689/B6277 junction, but in doing so it creates a new problem for at least 18 properties on Townhead, Front Street and Overburn. This is simply passing on the problem to individual householders and it isn't acceptable.</p> <p>Parking alternatives are needed right across Alston and the issue should be addressed strategically and with a long term solution found, rather than leaving council tax payers to scabble around looking for ever decreasing options.</p> <p>If both councils are intent on removing parking options completely as this proposal indicates, then among the options you should consider is a residents parking permit scheme - one permit per household, for the remaining street space and the car park on the Nenthead road, and the car park behind the Topp. I have seen this work well in other places, indeed it is commonplace across the country. For what it is worth, the majority of people who park illegally in the area you are proposing to double yellow line are not actually the residents, they are other locals from the villages and sometimes tourists. Also, we rarely see traffic wardens in Alston so there is little deterrent in place for rogue parkers who know they'll never get a ticket.</p> <p><i>(Officer comment - the proposed restrictions are intended to address the specific, localised problem of obstructive parking at a junction. The A689, immediately to the east of this proposal, is suitable for on street parking on both sides of the street; being wide and having a lay-by/defined parking bay on the north side. A free car park is also located approx. 80m east. A residents parking scheme is beyond the scope of this scheme and was not considered as part of this proposal).</i></p>
A689/B5277, Alston.	Resident	<p>We have been resident at the above address since 1993 and when we purchased the house there were no parking restrictions whatsoever in the vicinity.</p> <p>In the early 2000s a daytime single yellow line was introduced around the junction and in front of our house which we accepted as the argument was the school bus having to negotiate the junction on the rare occasions that inconsiderate parking had caused difficulty.</p> <p>The primary school closed down last year but the single yellow line with an 8am to 6pm restriction was left in place and still remains.</p> <p>In the 25 years we have never seen any sort of accident apart from 2 minor collisions caused by cars not leaving handbrakes on !</p> <p>For many years until the Blue circle cement plant in Weardale closed 50 plus fully laden cement waggons passed through this junction every day (and night ) and no mention was ever made of increased parking restrictions</p> <p>We also note that these proposals make no provision for alternative parking either for residents or tourists when parking volumes have increased greatly in the last decade.</p> <p>There are currently 3 empty houses with no off street parking within 50 feet of the junction and when they sold parking pressure will only increase.</p> <p>We would question what evidence you are drawing on to prove a need for even further restrictions and would suggest that at the very least you consider an extensive traffic survey or a lengthy period of video surveillance to help inform a decision which would further disadvantage residents of an isolated area where access to private transport is vital. <i>(Officer comment - this proposal is based on local member requests and concerns and complaints received from a local coach operator and CCC Highways gritting teams. As stated in the response to the previous comment, alternative parking exists to the east of the proposal).</i></p>
B5320, Pooley Bridge	Business	<p>Concern that the stop could be used as an unofficial short-term parking/waiting area for motorists accessing local facilities and delivery drivers. This in turn would force buses/coaches to pull up alongside these vehicles, partially blocking the carriageway. This would be exacerbated by the increased footway width (and resultant loss of carriageway width). <i>(Officer comment - the intention is to introduce this as a bus stop clear way, which would make the feature an enforceable restriction. No TRO is required for the bus stop clearway itself, only removal of the existing parking places).</i></p>
B5320, Pooley Bridge	Business	<p>Support - Regarding the new no waiting markings, the proposal broadly matches the request made by us, via our parish council, in March 2017. We see it as a significant improvement to road safety and safe access in the Finkle Street area. As the owner of Ullswater Guest House we have a duty of care to our guests which includes safe egress from the premises. This is frequently compromised with the line of sight being blocked by badly parked cars, lorries and buses. In addition, badly parked vehicles have a detrimental effect on our business when guests are unable to get in or out at all. For us, this can't happen soon enough.</p> <p>Regarding the new bus stop, based upon the information provided we are happy in principle to support this proposal. However, there are a few things that may change that view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We assume that the bus stop will be just that and not a place where coaches will wait for long periods with their engines running and disturbing our guests</li> <li>• The new wider footpath appears to impact on our dropped kerb, will the dropped kerb be protected or will turning left out of our property be further restricted?</li> <li>• Will the road surface be re-aligned so that water flows in to the drain rather than puddling along the gutter? <i>(Officer comment - as stated for the previous comment, a bus stop clearway will be introduced to prevent unnecessary waiting. Access to the property will not be further restricted. The design team are aware of the issues regarding drainage and will make every effort to resolve this).</i></li> </ul>

C3042, Howtown	Parish Council	<p>Object - 'First, emergency vehicles and farm machinery need to be able to pass safely through this area. Those who live closest recognise that on a few days of the year inconsiderate car parking can cause a nuisance, as does parking of coaches delivering visitors to the Outdoor Activity Centre. However, on balance, parking restrictions in this area are seen as being neither necessary nor desirable. "All the year round" and "at all times" parking restrictions would cause serious inconvenience to residents and visitors and should not be introduced without a traffic survey that provided hard evidence of a problem not otherwise soluble. Parked cars do not stop the passage of traffic.</p> <p>The area of the proposed restriction is relatively heavily used by pedestrians using the steamer and is a busy crossing point for the well-used footpath starting in the field opposite and for people emerging from the Outward Bound driveway (which does not have good visibility). Yellow lines could lead to traffic passing through the area at higher speed than currently: some parked cars causes traffic to slow, making the area safer for pedestrians and those visiting the lakeshore.</p> <p>There is no alternative place for those launching boats to park - unless they are expected to launch a boat and then leave it, perhaps unattended, to go and park some distance away and walk back along the road. If the yellow lines are limited, this will tempt people to park in unrestricted, and narrower parts of the road beyond the lines increasing inconvenience and obstruction.</p> <p>In this area of natural beauty, where signage is kept to a minimum, double yellow lines and the required signage to make it enforceable will be an eyesore for everyone - residents and visitors alike - year round. In the view of many, such eyesores far outweigh any current minor inconvenience the current parking situation may cause to a limited number of people.</p> <p>Questions have been raised about the cost to the taxpayer when any limited benefit would accrue mainly to a single semi commercial undertaking; also, which public body would enforce the parking restriction; and what would be the actual cost of the works proposed? Could this information be elicited by a Freedom of Information request?</p> <p><i>(Officer comment - The original complaints and requests, which prompted this proposal, raised a number issues; obstruction being caused at the access of the outdoor centre, obstruction of access to the boat landing, and parked vehicles obscuring pedestrians crossing the road. It is claimed that these issues have become much more frequent since surfacing works were carried out several years ago, deleting the already faded single yellow lines.</i></p> <p><i>The circumstances described at the boat landing, and potential resultant parking issues, could exasperate any issues of obstruction in the area. A reduced length of non-enforceable 'KEEP CLEAR' markings (protecting only the facility access) may be more acceptable to the Parish and residents.</i></p> <p><i>The works currently proposed would cost approx. £500 with the administrative cost being similar again. Cumbria County Councils Parking Services would enforce the restriction. The deterrent effect of restrictions in rural locations is often relied upon for them to be effective, with enforcement being increased in instances of a restriction being regularly contravened. A freedom of information request could be made, though little information further to that stated above could be gained).</i></p>
C3042, Howtown	Business	<p>Original request/support - Following the most recent surface dressing (in the last two years) of the road from Pooley Bridge to Howtown, I voiced my concern over the loss of the double yellow lines which had been on the road directly across from the gateway entrance/exit to The Outward Bound Trust Centre at Howtown, between the public access slipway and the private jetties owned by The Outward Bound Trust. These were not repainted after the surface dressing. I was told that there was a policy within The Lake District National Park to avoid putting down single or double yellow lines unless absolutely necessary.</p> <p>Our Residential Centre at Howtown caters for up to 72 school children at any one time - we are a charitable trust providing an extension to these children's school education - outdoor education outside the classroom, and as such are regarded as part of many school's education provision for their pupils. The loss of the double yellow lines has had a significant impact on the safety of these children for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We now find that vehicles VERY regularly park immediately across the road from our gate, on the section of road where the double yellow lines used to be. There have been numerous occasions where our own minibuses have been unable to make the turn into or out of our drive because of this parking and in addition, delivery wagons have not been able to make their deliveries. This situation indicates to us that in the event of a fire at our Centre, if vehicles continue to park as they regularly do opposite our gate, emergency service vehicles - fire engines and ambulances - would not be able to access our property, thus potentially endangering further the lives of our young people. We rarely experienced such situations when the double yellow lines were in place.</li> <li>2. Since the loss of the double yellow lines, we have had a number of 'Near Misses' where children crossing the road have nearly been hit by vehicles pulling out to avoid the cars which have parked where the double yellow lines used to be and only seeing the pedestrians crossing the road at the last minute. Additionally, children crossing the road from the lake side in order to access our gate have not been seen by oncoming cars because the pedestrians have been obscured by the parked cars. The most recent event occurred at 10:10 hours on Wednesday 6th July 2016; on this occasion, if the child crossing the road had not jumped out of the way, he would have been hit.</li> </ol> <p>May I respectfully ask you to again consider the reinstatement of the double yellow lines on this stretch of road? To me, this is one of those situations where it IS absolutely necessary; while we do our utmost to supervise children when they cross the road, as one always experiences with young people, there are times when one slips under the radar and makes the crossing unauthorised and unsupervised; the situation as it now stands is a danger to children and an accident waiting to happen. I find it impossible to understand the difference between roads outside a school which all have very strict parking restrictions, and the road outside the Centre at Howtown which is working with these same children. Surely we should be applying the same safety considerations for the children wherever they are. <i>(Officer comment - Martindale Parish Council requested that all restrictions be removed from the C3042 in the mid - late 90s. Cumbria County Council Highways officers agreed this and that the road markings + signs would not be maintained but allowed to wear off over time. The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be amended to reflect this change following the next instance of the route being resurfaced (following the necessary processes and consultations). The local community representatives disagree with the sentiments raised here and would wish to see measures that are less restrictive and intrusive than lengths of double yellow lines implemented).</i></p>

C3042, Howtown	Resident	<p>Partial Support - Restrictions on parking at Howtown are welcome, in themselves, but the arrangements proposed seem to benefit chiefly the Outward Bound centre there. Visitors who find fresh restrictions by the foreshore will look elsewhere, parking will be pushed further up the Hause and yet more vehicles will try to squeeze into the area next to St Peter's Church.</p> <p>The underlying problem, which you should be addressing urgently, is simply the numbers of vehicles using the road, both private cars and the 60 seater coaches that bring children to the Outward Bound Centre. The coaches are much resented by local residents. The presence of vehicles that size on such a narrow road is completely inappropriate and causes constant problems. Outward Bound have consistently failed to respond to local concerns and to act upon suggestions that the children should disembark from their coaches at Pooley Bridge and complete the journey to Howtown either in relays in an O.B. minibus or by water - from the O.B. centre opposite at Watermillock or by arrangement with the Ullswater steamer company. Outward Bound is one of the best funded charities in the UK and ought to shoulder the expense of one of these arrangements for the sake of the environment they are teaching children to respect.</p> <p>The issue of private cars on the road to Howtown and into Martindale is a much larger one but extremely serious. Visitors arriving in their own cars are spoiling the beautiful place they have come to enjoy and spoiling it for those who arrive by other means and for those who live there (and who are in many respects stewards of the local countryside). The solution is not straightforward. It would require considerable parking space at Pooley Bridge and a public minibus service to Howtown. However, the matter has been discussed for years and there has been no lack of practical suggestions which you could consider.</p>
----------------	----------	--