**Results and Analysis of Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire ‘Our Roads’ results**

As background to this analysis, it should perhaps be mentioned that, in the 2006 Westbourne Parish Plan, the questions attracting the most comments related to traffic and the problems it creates. Fifty-nine per cent of those comments related to parking, 53% to speeding and 38% to the volume of traffic.

Just under 320 people completed the ‘Our Roads’ section of the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire, a response rate of approximately 30%. Respondents were required to use a 1 to 5 Likert scale, 1 indicating strong disagreement with the statement and 5 indicating strong agreement. The 14 areas covered were generated by a leaflet survey distributed to all households in the parish in June/July 2013 and comments posted at a ‘Have your say’ event held in the Parish Hall in January 2014. Though there was no obligation to respond to all 14 ‘questions’, the vast majority of people did so.

**Quantitative date**

Dealing with the quantitative data first, three areas received an average score above 4.0, meaning that these are high priorities. These were:

1. The restriction of heavy vehicles through the village (access only) - 4.39
2. Improved public transport (with a potential shuttle to Emsworth) - 4.18
3. Improvements in The Square to increase parking and reduce congestion - 4.03

Seven of the 14 areas received an average score of between 3.5 and 4.0, thus being identified as priority areas. These were:

1. Traffic-calming measures - 3.94
2. A car park in Westbourne - 3.92
3. Pedestrian crossings in The Square - 3.67
4. The provision of a bus shelter - 3.63
5. Measures to create a more pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly village - 3.59
6. Gateways marking entrances to the village - 3.54
7. A Community Car Transport Scheme - 3.54

The remaining four areas scored below 3.0, indicating that they were of less importance to the people of Westbourne. These were:

1. Conversion of some verges to car parking - 2.96
2. The creation of additional pavements at the expense of road width - 2.76
3. Introduction of Residents Parking Permits - 2.64
4. More local access to the A27 - 2.30

In summary, it would seem that the nature, volume and speed of traffic using the somewhat congested roads in the village are all serious concerns. The increased volume of traffic which is already an inevitability due to recent development in communities adjacent to Westbourne means that the situation is even worse than it was when the Parish Plan was put together some nine years ago. There are clearly no easy solutions, but the citizens of Westbourne would like to see a number of measures undertaken in order to ensure that their community is a much more pleasant place to live and that people’s lives are no longer blighted by large volumes of fast-moving traffic.

We now turn to the qualitative data, consisting of comments related to each of the 14 areas, in the hope that some kind of consensus might emerge regarding practical actions that could be taken to address the current undesirable situation.

**Qualitative data**

Turning to the qualitative data, respondents were invited to add comments to all of the 14 areas, and this facility was put to good use. A comprehensive list of all comments is to be found in the appendix

1. **Introduction of Residents Parking Permits (2.64 and 56 comments)**

Whilst several respondents felt that they would value the opportunity to park outside or close to their own home, which is currently not always the case, the difficulty of enforcing such a scheme was remarked upon as was the additional expense entailed. It was also believed that a Residents Parking Permit Scheme could well deter visitors from using the village with negative consequences for local businesses and that, without a car park, this would not alleviate the parking problems.

1. **A car park in Westbourne (3.92 and 83 comments)**

Most respondents were in favour of a car park, which was seen as very much needed, but asked where it could be sited. This could be of particular benefit to local businesses. Any car park would be preferably free or perhaps with minimal pay and display charges. There was some concern that the addition of a car park would not involve the loss of any open green spaces. The two potential sites that were mentioned were the field behind the Parish Hall and the Wren Centre. It was felt that any car park would need to be situated reasonably centrally as people are reluctant to walk very far.

1. **Conversion of some verges to car parking (2.96 and 67 comments)**

Whilst several respondents felt converting certain grass verges to car parking would somehow change the (rural) character of the village, it was generally recognised that the current situation whereby numerous cars park on grass verges in certain parts of the village is far from ideal .Where this is the case, for example, in Mill Road, Churcher Road and Homefield Road, it might be better to provide additional car parking spaces rather than having the grass verges churned up.

1. **Traffic calming measures (3.94 and 83 comments)**

There is clearly concern about ‘persistent speeding and anti-social driving in the village’, although some of the respondents felt that the parked cars already did a pretty good job in keeping speeds down. As far as traffic calming measures are concerned, there was little consensus as to what exactly might be most effective, and where they are most needed. Generally, there was support for a 20mph zone throughout the village, and the area of greatest concern were Whitechimney Row and River Street, where the primary school is located. Some were in favour of speed humps but more were opposed. Signs and speed indicators were advocated by some, as was a clearer indication that people were entering the village.

1. **The restriction of heavy vehicles through the village (access only) (4.39 and 42 comments)**

This item received the highest score (4.39/5.0), which indicates very clearly that people would like to see fewer heavy vehicles on the village’s narrow roads. However, when it comes to the comments, there is a conspicuous lack of practical/realistic solutions. Respondents appreciated that that heavy vehicles needed to have access to the village but do they (for example, those servicing the Co-op, Animal Feeds, the pubs and the bakery) need to be so large? There was a general feeling that through traffic should be restricted but few suggestions as to how this could be achieved. Diversion signs sending heavy goods vehicles along Emsworth Common Road and Horndean Road? Are Sat Navs exacerbating the situation?

1. **Gateways marking entrances to the village (3.54 and 41 comments)**

Opinion was relatively divided regarding the potential benefits of gateways. Whilst some respondents felt that gateways might aid traffic calming and the retention of the village’s separate identity, others felt they were an unnecessary expense and would be unlikely to serve any useful purpose. Mention of the need to extend any scheme to Woodmancote and Aldsworth.

1. **Pedestrian crossings in The Square (3.67 and 62 comments)**

There was general consensus that crossing the road in the middle of Westbourne could be extremely hazardous and that some kind of arrangement needed to be made to facilitate safe crossing. Many respondents saw this issue as being linked to traffic-calming measures and a 20mph speed limit as well as the possible reconfiguration of The Square (greater pedestrianisation?). Slower traffic speed would mean that crossing the road becomes less dangerous. With regard to the siting of a crossing, there were few suggestions, though the north end of The Square was mentioned by three or four people.

1. **The creation of additional pavements at the expense of road width (2.76 and 44 comments)**

Again no consensus emerges here, which appears to be a consequence of the fact that pavements exist in some parts of the village but not in others. Furthermore, in some parts they are too narrow and in others possibly too wide. It is also acknowledged that additional pavements would result in narrower roads, which is generally seen as undesirable. The lack of any kind of pavement in Whitechimney Row, River Street and in front of the Stag’s Head, and the narrowness of the pavement in the vicinity of the Parish Hall, get special mention.

1. **Measures to create a more pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly village (3.59 and 43 comments)**

It was generally felt that traffic-calming measure, including a 20mph zone would make the village more pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly. A number of strategies were suggested but there was no clear consensus. Some respondents made mention of inconsiderate cyclists, especially those who go through the village in ‘packs’. Cyclists were to be discouraged from using pavements. There were requests for a cycle path to Bourne Community College and one to North Emsworth.

1. **Improvements in The Square to increase parking and reduce congestion (4.03 and 73 comments)**

Another area in which there was significant overall general agreement. However, there was less agreement when it came to the exact nature of any improvement. On the whole, there was a feeling that the space was not being used optimally. Several respondents felt that the number of parking spaces could be increased were vehicles to park diagonally rather than parallel to the kerb on the west side of The Square. Others felt the area could be better utilised as a people space, balancing parking with places to sit and enjoy The Square. Of course, the needs of delivery vehicles also have to be taken into account. Many respondents suggest making the road in front of the Co-op one way.

1. **Improved public transport (with a potential shuttle to Emsworth) (4.18 and 52 comments)**

**P**erhaps because of recent reductions in buses serving the village, this appears to be an area of great concern, particularly, of course, to those without their own means of transport and to the elderly. A number of destinations are mentioned but Chichester comes up time and time again. There were, however, reservations that such services would be financially viable, which is probably why they were cut in the first place. Smaller buses were suggested and some kind of shuttle to Emsworth seemed to find favour with quite a few respondents.

1. **The provision of a bus shelter (3.63 and 31 comments)**

One of the comments appears to capture the general feeling of many of the respondents: “nice but not essential as services are restricted and often no one waiting in the Square”. Were there to be a bus shelter - and opinion was divided - it was thought it should probably be located in The Square and that care should be taken to ensure that it was in keeping with the character of the village – a wooden structure?

1. **A Community Car Transport Scheme (3.54 and 32 comments)**

Generally believed to be a good idea but it was pointed out that EVCT (Ems Valley Community Transport) is already in existence.

1. **More local access to the A27 (2.30 and 53 comments)**

Included as a possible way to avoid Westbourne being used as a ‘rat run’, this option met with the least agreement/most disagreement. Though not universal, people were, in general, of the opinion that more local access to the A27 would lead to increased traffic through the village rather than less.

**Conclusions and Implications for NP Policy**

Still to come.

**Appendix**

**Respondents’ comments**

**Parking**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | **Introduction of Residents Parking Permits** |
| * Cause havoc.
* No fee should be required
* Difficulties arise when a resident has visiting guests. Do we have extra permits to cover this? Depends on which streets – think it should be carefully targeted.
* Will discourage visitors to the village using local businesses and may cause some to close down.
* If on-street parking went, it would discourage people popping into the village, and would shop elsewhere.
* To include Woodmancote residents.
* Homes in the village need their parking spaces protected.
* Serious interference with access by visitors.
* Would enable us to at least park on our street.
* No need. Always somewhere to park. Absolutely not!
* Makes sense but impracticable to enforce, just as current parking restrictions are impracticable.
* This would make it impossible for people outside the village to park.
* Deters visitors, business and pleasure. Costs will not help parking situation.
* Won’t reduce sheer volume of cars and nowhere to park.
* Only if an alternative car park is provided.
* Permit parking for residents only on main roads through the village, Foxbury Lane, East Street, North Street.
* They just displace parking. Can’t see how that would work in a village.
* Some people leave a car for days in Church road making it very hard for residents.
* It’s great for residents but then those that aren’t residents cause parking problems outside the permit zone.
* It is only residents who park in Westbourne! This would inhibit local business.
* So many houses with no garages.
* Only if you can police the parking and permits.
* Parking issues are residents cars rather than visitors.
* Too many cars park on the pavements.
* Excellent idea but difficult to implement.
* No.
* We need more policing of existing parking. We had a blitz in North Street at time of resurfacing of road and it worked well.
* Parking must be addressed.
* For which streets? How fair are these for residents?
* Even more expense for owning a car.
* We are not affected by this as parking is available where we live.
* No!
* Do many non-residents park here?
* Would hamper the use of business by their customers and visitors. This is not London – it may be busy, but that is due to poor planning in the past. It is a vibrant village – it is busy.
* It should be possible to park outside your own home. We never can.
* Only if car park developed.
* Only if parking improved for visitors, shopping etc.
* No, No, No, they are a total nightmare.
* How much will they cost? Would Aldsworth and Woodmancote be classed as residents for parking in Westbourne?
* Usually involves a payment!
* The yellow lines are largely ignored. So who will “police” parking permits?
* For 2 or more cars?
* Commercial vehicles should pay for overnight parking within residential public places.
* This is always a tricky thing as it might mean problems for visitors to the local shops.
* The permits are a good idea but they have to be accompanied by compensating parking space.
* In some cases.
* Who would enforce it??
* No need.
* Residents probably contribute most to parking problems – ie: 2 or more cars.
* This is the surest way to stop external visitors to Westbourne.
* A good idea in principle but could lead to congested parking in places where permits are not in operation.
* May help deter commercial vehicles blocking roads overnight.
* Turn Westbourne into Southsea!
* Only if there is a public car park.
* Do nothing to reduce the number of “occasional stopping places”
* Why not 20 mins max outside the Co-op instead of no parking at present between 8am and 6pm on single yellows?
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2 | **A car park in Westbourne** |
| * But where?
* Where?
* The land behind the village hall could be utilized with access from Lumley Road or via vicar’s house and millstream entrances.
* But where would you site it? It would have to be central to be useful.
* A pay and display (low charges) with public conveniences to encourage more tourism to the village and create more business for local businesses.
* This is an absolute must.
* This should be free to attract shoppers. I often by-pass Emsworth for free shopping in Havant.
* Excellent if feasible. Free to use of course.
* To stop people blocking “New Road” with cars when popping into fish and chip shop. Dangerous and on yellow lines.
* But where could it go? No space already.
* Very much needed.
* Is it possible?
* Long overdue.
* Where could it go?
* Currently cars for the doctors, chemists etc park on our roads and the majority of the time we are unable to park here let alone outside our house!
* Keep green spaces- crime target.
* For use when using shops only – could be a charge.
* Depending on site chosen.
* Where?
* Nowhere to park!
* No room for one!
* A high priority. This should have been provided years ago.
* Attract people to businesses and create revenue stream. Safe place to park.
* Where?
* Would be convenient but where would it be situated
* But where?
* A car park badly needed.
* May assist with access to local business.
* Would help to avoid street parking.
* Yes but not at the expense of loss of open space – only if on brownfield sites
* This would become a source of anti-social behaviour and costly to maintain.
* If land can be found for one.
* Should not be too expensive so as to deter people coming to Westbourne.
* More likely to have theft/vandalism.
* Where?
* Where: near enough for people to use it.
* Utilise Wren Centre car park in evenings and weekends.
* Where?
* The Wren Centre.
* At present the level of cars doesn’t justify it.
* Just keep like it is.
* Great idea but no practical place unless the garage opposite the bakery could be purchased and turned into a car park.
* Could seriously help – could be interesting to see where though.
* Nice idea but if not central would not be used.
* Not sure where a car park could go but would be useful.
* Yes, please!
* Well overdue, if we want to encourage more business they would need parking.
* Where would it be within walking distance into the centre of the village.
* No land?
* Where?
* If a site can be found.
* Behind Church Hall. This Ex- watercress field can take 24 cars.
* Small one – but location?
* Free car park.
* Where is the space for a car park.
* At the Wren Centre?
* Where?
* I think it is needed, but goodness only knows where.
* The field behind the Parish Hall has to be the most suitable site.
* But where?
* But where?
* Yes, but where?
* Where? No spaces left.
* Behind the Church Hall in the manky horsefield.
* Is it really necessary? Where will it go?
* A good idea but where to site it?
* Depends on where it would be placed.
* This would immediately fill up and encourage car use leading to more traffic. Also would take up land.
* If it can be done without detriment to street scene.
* No site available where parking needed. Secluded site could lead to vandalism of vehicles.
* No need.
* Where?
* No available sites.
* Where?
* Where would you put it?
* Where?
* Wonderful to have one but where?
* We need a car park near the village hall.
* Something needs to be done to eliminate the parking problem in North Street.
* Where? Most people won’t even walk 10 yards from their car to a shop.
* Vital before any new building.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 | **Conversion of some verges to car parking** |
| * Only with agreement of residents affected.
* Ugly
* Long Copse Lane site could be used for parking. Mill Lane (sic) and Churcher Roads, etc could be narrowed and thus the road widened and cars would thus easily pass the parked cars.
* This would be sad but perhaps practical, e.g. Mill Road.
* The grass verges feed the starlings in the area and makes the housing areas much nicer and not looking like car parks. People should use their driveways and garages.
* This would make car presence over-powering.
* Outside Westbourne Primary School is a priority and would be much needed and would have local support, I believe.
* Mill Road is a disgrace. Turn to parking. Safer for children and more slightly.
* There is often limited space to park around Westbourne.
* As people are doing it already in Edgehill etc – making it more formal might reduce the dirt etc.
* A mess.
* Depends where.
* Not ideal but probably more practical.
* Only if it was not an option.
* Cars park on the grass anyway esp. near the school on school days preventing residents from parking near their own homes.
* Grass verges are a valuable environmental resource, both to people as part of the landscape and for biodiversity, supporting large numbers of insects, flora and fauna.
* OK as long as it looks tidy and doesn’t get used for abandoned vehicles
* Agreed – where cars currently park on grass the area has become an eyesore
* Only if done properly and sustainably.
* Where used currently for parking.
* Household on average own 2 vehicles be it cars or vans/lorries causing chaos every time.
* Where?
* Mill Road.
* If this were to be favoured then it must be carefully controlled.
* At a push.
* Most households on my road have more than one car and park on the grass. (Idon’t have a car), where it is now either a muddy or a dust patch.
* Triangle at end of Whitechimney Row and Foxbury Lane/East Street to be removed to widen road.
* I think it could cause mayhem to a degree.
* To tidy up existing unilateral parking beside Mill Rd/Edgell Rd/Foxbury Lane areas.
* There are some areas which would help.
* Which?
* Only where it is really needed, it would stop the grass being churned up.
* Not sure where the grass verges are to do this.
* That would ruin the character of the village.
* A lot of the verges are ruined because of parking, so it seems sensible to make them hard standing.
* No!
* Not sure if all grass verges should be made parking areas.
* Would add to urban sprawl.
* Allow some developments provided it includes a car park.
* There is good grass available in parks and surrounding countryside – Cars do need to be parked.
* If we took away the grass verges, this would change the look and feel of the village.
* The areas with grass verges generally aren’t the ones where there is a problem with parking.
* Especially Mill Road.
* Appreciate the limited areas available.
* Sensible.
* It would destroy the rural charm of the village.
* What grass verges?
* Verge parking on Foxbury Lane for residents may be an exception. Current parking looks ugly.
* No – put bollards up. Do we consider cars a priority?
* People park on the grass in Mill Road/Churchers/Homefield. Formal parking with suds will improve amenity.
* Mill Road was a real mess this winter with all the cars parked on the verges.
* Not really sure about this.
* The character of the village would be compromised.
* Verges should be better protected from parking.
* Not sure. I know some people are very against it. If conversion, it must be permeable to rain etc.
* Destructive to character/environment.
* Could provide parking where needed so long as surfaced to prevent looking like a ploughed field.
* Better than building car park.
* No.
* Mill Road.
* Many cars now already park on grass verges.
* Parking on mill Road grass verges has made a muddy mess and can be hazardous to pedestrians walking to and from the school due to visability.
* Grass verges should be made into proper parking spaces.
* Keep green area even if verge.
* Verges will be used anyway so hard surfacing would be better than a sea of mud as near the primary school.
* Where?
* Only where it provides a full vehicle width carriage way in both directions.
 |

**Traffic through the village**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | **Traffic calming measures** |
| * Yes, providing they are sensitive to village ambience.
* Deliveries are needed for the traders.
* Bumps in Foxbury Lane 20mph enforced.
* If they have been proved to work. The light up signs seem to be effective.
* Path outside parade of shops should be wider and the road single track with traffic lights to stop traffic from short cutting through Westbourne and use Emsworth Common Road or A27 trunk road to Chichester.
* It can often be chaotic and dangerous at peak times.
* Not necessary.
* The “Square” is a tarmac jungle and free for all – widen pavements and restrict road width. One way system around Stag – Triangle. This could be an attractive area with green and coffee tables etc.
* Police check-ups!! Reduce speed limit at all entries to Westbourne.
* Between Church and church hall.
* Don’t want more intrusive signs in the village.
* Speed bumps.
* In River street by the school.
* Some drivers are too fast through the village.
* On White Chimney Row.
* Current situation means that traffic is calmed.
* Could introduce a 20 mile speed restriction.
* Dangerous speeding on narrow streets in Westbourne – particularly Whitechimney Row.
* But not speed bumps which ruin car tyres and suspension systems. RIGID enforcement of speed limits.
* Deliveries to and from Co-op store should be before 7am and after midnight.
* Whitechimney Row/River Street. No pavement and narrow.
* Definitely not speed bumps. Parking on both sides of the roads slows traffic anyway.
* Yes, most essential.
* Unnecessary due to so many cars parked.
* Whitechimney row should be narrow enough to restrict, but doesn’t.
* Very important as crossing the square is very dangerous.
* Especially Whitechimney Row.
* This is essential esp. at all entry points to the village.
* Signs and speed indicators.
* Stop persistent speeding and anti-social driving within village roads.
* Yes, especially East Street. This road can be widened by means of reducing the pavement on the sides of the garages. This pavement is over 2 meters wide. This could be reduced.
* People don’t drive too fast, there are just too many of them.
* Yes, 20mph throughout.
* Re-route the B2147 via Horndean Rd/Emsworth Common Rd.
* 20mph needed along North Street in Square.
* 20 is plenty.
* Go slow signs. Speed bumps by the row of shops from the church to the fish and chip shop.
* No bumps and humps but enforce speed limits eg. On Foxbury Lane.
* 20mph.
* Of course.
* If this can be done without speed bumps.
* 20mph limit, yes. Speed bumps and chicanes – no.
* Speed bumps cause structural problems with near-by housing.
* Particularly between Cemetery lane and junction with Whitechimney Road.
* Too much parking to make it impossible to go fast so it is immaterial.
* 20mph limit on Monk’s Hill with camera.
* A one way system should reduce the problem.
* Why not?
* Though it always causes stress especially if you live near it.
* 20mph limit should help.
* I don’t think there’s a current problem.
* To slow it to 20mph.
* Along Foxbury Lane @Cemetery Lane junction.
* The congestion already slows down the traffic!
* Too many parked cars automatically reduce the speed of vehicles.
* Traffic signs at Foxbury Lane, Monk’s Hill and New Brighton Road should have “Westbourne Village Users Only” signs.
* Always an eyesore. Intrusive.
* 20MPH through Woodmancote village , lots of parked cars to pub and also horses through village.
* 20 is plenty.
* 20mph flashing sign.
* Monk’s Hill especially.
* 20mph speed limit; speed bumps.
* The parked cars do a pretty good job at keeping the speeds down. I don’t see it as a problem in the village at all.
* Foxbury Lane and Whitechimney Road must be priorities.
* Speeding on ways out/in is common.
* Solid pinch points NOT. Humps
* White chimney Row is not suitable for through traffic. 20mph or speed bumps won’t help.
* Most residents seem to drive carefully. But those who don’t will ignore any calming measures.
* Our lethargy has done nothing. Bring in chicanes.
* The parked cars slow the traffic down quite well.
* Traffic calming needs to be at the top of Westbourne. The speed at this point is ridiculous!
* At most times speed of traffic is self-regulated by road structures and on street parking.
* The speed at which traffic travels through the village is scary!
* The approach down Foxbury Lane is too enticing for speeding motorists.
* They often take up room, preventing on-road parking.
* Yes.
* Enforce speed limit!!
* Road side parking acts as a means of slowing vehicles.
* But not too many.
* Particularly at Foxbury Lane at entrance to the village.
* Need slow signs near the church where there is blind points.
* Rumble strips on approaches to village. Possible 20mph in the main village.
* Anything but road humps.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5 | **The restriction of heavy vehicles through the village (access only)** |
| * Except buses.
* Pay road tax.
* Large sign on Common Road into Foxbury Lane informing lorry drivers that the best way to Emsworth is to avoid the narrow lanes of Westbourne by continuing along Emsworth Common Road and turn left into Emsworth on Horndean Road. The lorries’ GPS systems direct them from Funtington to Emsworth via Westbourne as it is the shorter route.
* Yes - not suitable for large lorries.
* This also applies to Woodmancote.
* This has been caused by and increased by the use of “Sat-Nav”.
* Not aware HGV’s are a problem.
* Not viable or rational/realistic. People need deliveries etc.
* Large vehicles are a problem.
* Obviously some heavy vehicles need to have access.
* Roads too small and vulnerable.
* Impractical.
* This would be great on the noise level as well as traffic calming.
* Not sure how many HGVs other than those needing access really come through.
* This is a rural community. Some farm traffic should be allowed.
* We must allow deliveries.
* Heavy vehicles can’t get through the village because of the parking issues.
* One way system around Co-op and Spice cottage.
* Access to village only.
* Practicality.
* A must!
* Apply time regulations.
* The lorry got to deliver to our shops in village.
* Will our bridges take them? Liaise with Co-op, Animal Feeds and pubs to get smaller delivery vehicles at all times.
* Deliveries – food, internet goods, building goods.
* I don’t think there’s a current problem.
* Co-op lorries to be monitored and to come no earlier than 7am.
* This is very difficult because of the low bridge in Emsworth and the narrow road in Whitechimney Row.
* Co-op is a problem – would be helped by one way traffic round houses on “island”.
* Access must be allowed.
* Road blocked by over-sized HGV’s to pet food store on a daily basis – close shop.
* My house shakes daily!
* Heavy vehicles must be banned from Whitechimney Row. Had my bag ripped from my shoulder by a lorry last week!
* Because of the low bridges in Emsworth there are few heavy vehicles using the village as a through route.
* But how will the Co-op be stocked and the buses run?
* Most are agricultural or serve the Co-op. You cannot be selective on who or what uses the roads.
* The delivery lorries for the Co-op are bad enough.
* Most heavy vehicles seem to have a reason for passing through – deliveries, agricultural machinery buses.
* Co-op lorry blocks whole road regularly.
* Only delivery.
* Not only do we need to restrict through-traffic, but also incentivise the Co-op, removal firms etc to bring only small lorries into the village The Co-op does not need so many giant lorries to deliver.
* It only increases the distance they must drive and passes the trouble on to others to endure.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 6 | **Gateways marking entrances to the village** |
| * Of the right sort.
* May help Westbourne remain as a separate village with land gaps between adjacent areas.
* Could work and also reinforce village identity.
* This has been done successfully in Oxfordshire and looks great.
* This would also help in Woodmancote.
* We too pay our council tax to Westbourne parish and this should be extended to Woodmancote and Aldsworth.
* Better to have humps.
* If they were sympathetic to village. NOT intrusive signs!!!
* Not required.
* Excellent idea!
* Maybe a distinguishing feature.
* Good idea. It works in other villages.
* No. An unnecessary expense.
* This could help slow cars- 20MPH limit.
* Change road classification so that it does not appear on sat-nav.
* Don’t know.
* Good idea to slow traffic.
* Especially linked to high quality traffic calming measures.
* Yes would be a good idea.
* Can’t see the benefit.
* We are too large a village for this.
* Not sure what benefits this would have.
* Nice but doubt they have much effect.
* No! I know these are only decorative but they always make me feel uncomfortable.-like gated roads.
* No, roads not wide.
* Not sure what this means.
* A waste of money.
* Fancy waistcoats. More signs to be cleaned. Others are generally scruffy anyway.
* Only if funds allow.
* With one way access at each end eg. Selbourne.
* Could help to make boundary from Emsworth. Otherwise no need.
* Waste of money. Good chance of being vandalised.
* What on earth for.
* Why? Wasted additional cost!
* It would add to the character of the village.
* Pretty but not necessary.
* Unnecessary expense – speed limit signs are sufficient.
* Can’t see the point unless traffic calming.
* Possibly beneficial to have speed cameras and signs to help reduce speeding. Gateways alone will not help the situation.
* Aid traffic calming.
* No pinch points which reduce the carriageway in any way.
 |

**Pedestrians and cyclists**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 7 | **Pedestrian crossings in The Square** |
| * In conjunction with traffic calming
* Lose car parking spaces
* Safety.
* Yes – this is vital. Can’t believe there aren’t any.
* Road does get extremely busy during peak times. I walk to Emsworth Station daily for over 4 years and it takes longer to walk home.
* Crossing can be extremely hazardous.
* Not necessary.
* In tune with ideas on 4 – a restricted route with green space/trees and seating etc.
* It is amazing that a serious accident has not happened as yet!
* Too urban.
* Don’t really need more signs/messiness.
* No where currently in the village.
* The Square could be a raised pedestrian area.
* Safety.
* Unsafe to cross at any point in the village.
* Much needed.
* With traffic calming it should not be necessary.
* It is always difficult to cross as you can’t see what is approaching from the direction of the church.
* Not needed if the other steps taken to slow traffic.
* Linked to complete enhancement of the village Square.
* Possible 20mph through village.
* No, this would only increase traffic build-up.
* Inadequate sight-lines.
* Very dangerous currently.
* Don’t think it needs one.
* Essential before someone is killed.
* We need to improve the one way status through the village.
* Would be very useful.
* If a suitable place can be found.
* Only needed if traffic calming fails.
* Need one from Queen Head across.
* Can be sometimes tricky crossing.
* Not needed
* Yes.
* Yes.
* At present one takes one’s life in one’s hands when crossing the road.
* It would allow motorists to be aware of people crossing a very busy road.
* Really good idea.
* Good idea.
* I would suggest across the north end.
* Around the area of the café and the picture frame shop.
* It is very difficult and often dangerous to cross roads with pram.
* Yes, ideally one from Co-op across to Dukes Close and a shorter one from White Horse towards Drs. surgery.
* Yes please!
* Currently it can be quite hazardous especially for elderly/frail.
* Not necessary with traffic calming.
* Would greatly slow down traffic hurtling through the village.
* Yes, please. Junction dangerous!
* If traffic was calmed there would be no need for a crossing.
* We are NOT a city/town yet!
* The different bricks/tarmac in the road works well in Emsworth.
* Better achieved by pedestrianisation of the Square.
* Don’t need this – Just urbanising for the sake of it.
* Square is too wide for a crossing and it would serve as another stop/start point much like the Grove does now.
* When I broke my foot two years I appreciated how difficult it was to cross the road without running.
* Probably unnecessary if an additional pavement is introduced.
* One in the North would be good.
* Square too wide – safer to cross approach road.
* This is something that is really needed from a safety point of view.
* Eyesore.
* By bus-stop in Square.
* There are plenty of gaps in the traffic – be patient.
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| 8 | **The creation of additional pavements at the expense of road width** |
| * In conjunction with traffic calming.
* In a rural village.
* Sadly the available space is a necessity for car parking.
* Not sure.
* There are too many pinch points as it is.
* They park on the pavements now, so it will be worse.
* The narrowness of the pavements to and from the village hall, increasingly dangerous.
* Narrow streets are not safe to walk down – Whitechimney Row again.
* Where?
* Whitechimney Row and River street
* An idea but not practical.
* Along the Grove opposite the shops.
* This will reduce traffic speed and give greater priority to pedestrians.
* In some places perhaps this would be a welcome addition.
* Roads are already narrow with street parking.
* Traffic calming and 20mph enforceable limit.
* In some places.
* Where?
* No.
* If the road width is reduced would that not cause more traffic problems?
* If no pavements exist on either side of the road.
* No. Hard now for pedestrians/wheelchair users.
* Pavements need doing up. All of them around Westbourne.
* The roads are not very wide as it is.
* Apart from Whitechimney Row where is there a problem?
* Pavements are inadequate or non-existent in many of the roads in the NP designated area.
* Yes, on River Street near school.
* Given the level of street parking it’s hard to see how this could be achieved safely – ie North Street.
* Whitechimney Row.
* Just the opposite, especially East Street.
* River Street – Access routes to the school.
* River Street has grass verges which could be used and the narrow bit a painted line would help. Painted line in White chimney Row too.
* Just a bit of maintenance, Foxbury Lane is desperate for maintenance.
* Adequate as they are and would only reduce available parking.
* I believe that there are sufficient pavements.
* There should be a pavement running along the Stag’s head. The exit for the pub is right on the road.
* There are adequate pavements in the centre of the village.
* Would assist traffic calming through the village – traffic would also use less as cut-thru.
* Most of the pavements seem ok except by the Stag.
* Maybe at the edges of the Square – in-coming roads – Grove, East Street etc.
* Roads are narrow enough already.
* The roads are restricted enough by parked cars.
* Aid traffic slowing.
* Clamp down strongly against hedges and anything which restricts the pavement width.
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| 9 | **Measures to create a more pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly village** |
| * In conjunction with traffic calming
* No limits for cyclists who are a danger to all (clubs).
* Difficult with the lack of available space.
* Yes please.
* Too many people who live in the village drive to the Co-op, Whistler’s ,etc.
* Not needed. I cycle and have kids. But would prefer to maintain look and feel of village –not to introduce new signs/developments to make village look less rural.
* Speed bumps.
* Road calming would help to improve things but no great unsightly road markings wanted or needed.
* Very strongly agree.
* Would enhance village life.
* Footpath to link village to North Emsworth.
* At the moment it is dangerous and stops people walking. CRAZY.
* How?
* 20 mile speed limit.
* We have good villages locally. Good to have a safe child friendly cycle path rather than use the car.
* Already cycle and pedestrian friendly.
* This should be a major priority for the Neighbourhood plan.
* Cyclists should adhere to speed limits and not ride more than one abreast.
* 20mph through village.
* Enforce motorists to treat cyclists with respect.
* Cycle path to Bourne school.
* Great idea but how. Would like to see proposal before answering this.
* More drop curbs in appropriate places. 20mph speed limit will help cyclists.
* Paving should be made available with crossing the road.
* Perhaps keep friendly, very good village.
* No cycle paths except alongside old farm lane.
* No.
* Great idea but how?
* Cars drive too fast through village.
* I cycle and walk already and there are very few problems.
* Fix the potholes. Make North Street one way in southerly direction forcing northerly traffic via Foxbury Lane.
* No cyclists on the pavements.
* Cyclists are currently unfriendly. They ignore No Entry signs and go mob handed through the village.
* No shared surfaces allowed in any new building. Wide street pavements within any new housing, wide enough to position and drive down so cars don’t park on the pavements.
* Cyclists must be more self responsible.
* White Chimney Row is an important road out of the village but it is dangerous for walkers.
* Packs of cyclists are already very dangerous. Do NOT need encouraging.
* Yes.
* This is the only sure way of reducing traffic and parking demands.
* If it would work that would be great. Nothing to do.
* Enough cyclists already - a real hazard to pedestrians and motorists.
* I regularly notice pedestrians walking in the road when there is a perfectly good pavement, so why block the roads more.
* All cyclists through the village are only intent on going as fast as possible and riding all over the road.
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| 10 | **Improvements in The Square to increase parking and reduce congestion** |
| * How about getting some professional advice on possibilities for Q. 4, 7, 8, 9.
* Cannot be done safely.
* But how?
* Always congested, but especially at the weekend. One way system?
* Parking head on rather than parallel to the kerb will double the parking. Double yellow lines outside the Co-op.
* This would be good but very difficult.
* No! Decrease parking and use space to create an attractive feature in our village. Make it primarily a people space.
* This is greatly needed.
* Parking heavy enough in Square already.
* Only if it were to enhance look and feel of village. One way past the Co-op parking outside.
* One way system by the Co-op.
* One way system into North Street from Co-op would help. (going north).
* Turn by 90 degree parking outside the picture framers.
* Prefer a tree in the middle but parking and congestion are a problem – hense the need for a carpark.
* How?
* Create off-road parking whilst making improvements.
* A car park will definitely help the village.
* V. important, particularly outside Co-op and surgery.
* Not quite sure what.
* Square one way to allow parking by Co-op. Turn 90 degree parking outside Framers etc.
* Make road outside Co-op one way north.
* Vital.
* Will allow shops to flourish.
* But only if done to a very high standard, balancing parking with spaces to sit and enjoy the Square.
* Diagonal parking.
* A rather stupid question here as increasing parking provision will automatically increase traffic in the Square and hence congestion!
* Paint white lines in area outside doctors surgery to picture framing shop at 90 degree to pavement.
* One way traffic round Stags Head. No parking outside the Co-op.
* One way system around Co-op.
* Don’t know how.
* Use of wide area to increase parking. By angled parking to pavement.
* No parking outside Co-op.
* Please make the road outside the Co-op north bound traffic only and the road to bakery one way too.
* How?
* Out of village parking would be good.
* Something just keep it tidy, clean.
* One way system. Co-op lorries cause chaos, get them to have deliveries at night.
* Wasted space in the middle – implement herringbone parking – make Stag Triangle a one way system.
* Change passing format. Discourage delivery lorries before 7am.
* No room.
* Doesn’t make sense!
* Not sure what could be done as people want to shop and others who live in the area need to park their cars.
* Very important.
* Please do not increase parking in the Square.
* Could be achieved.
* What can be done in the Square? There is no space to increase parking.
* Not sure how this would work. Nice idea though.
* Bearing in mind the needs of buses and delivery vehicles.
* There are no parking problems or congestion problems.
* Unsure how achievable that would be.
* Need to retain a Square not a car park.
* Minimal congestion now – not needed.
* Need one way system around the Stag Pub.
* I think focus should be on a small green space to mark the centre of the village and make junction safer for pedestrians not car users.
* Diagonal/perpendicular parking outside doctors surgery.
* But how?
* It seems to me that you consider cars too much. Each householder has on the whole 2-3.
* Diagonal parking by bus-stop and Church Road.
* One way round the Stag’s Head island to help traffic flow?
* But increasing parking and reducing congestion doesn’t necessarily go hand in hand.
* How? People already park badly. More enforcement is necessary. Just because you are old or live here doesn’t mean you can do what you like.
* I do agree that this needs to be considered but at what cost?
* There is ample space to increase parking space along the West side of the Square, by allowing cars to park at an angle.
* If it is possible to achieve this it would be beneficial.
* Yes, good idea but how? One way system could assist safe movement.
* Depends what these are.
* I haven’t seen much in the way of congestion and anyway I have the feeling that congestion slows the traffic down and discourages drivers from shooting through the village.
* Already too many cars parked in the Square.
* Where?
* Reduce congestion definitely but would be worried about how extra parking would be created.
* There should be no parking in front of the post-box and the large puddle there should be dealt with.
* Definitely need a car park.
* May be more in the curb by the bus stop.
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| 11 | **Improved public transport (with a potential shuttle to Emsworth)** |
| * Particularly useful for going to Emsworth, for station, and because parking is difficult for shops there.
* Better but expensive. Funds needed.
* Vital
* We have a very limited bus service now.
* I’d rather walk- it’s healthier.
* Could a bus come via Woodmancote, at weekends if at all.
* What about Chichester?
* Recent bus service reduction has impacted older people. Some more direct Westbourne service needed.
* Increase service to Chichester. We only have ONE a day.
* Mini-bus would be nice.
* Need improved transport to and from Chichester. Very good for people who don’t drive and can’t get around easily – and what a nice place to drive.
* Smaller buses – stop the big buses – always empty.
* And Chichester.
* A great idea and would really help with parking in both Westbourne and Emsworth.
* Do not think this is financially viable even if it would be desirable.
* Check requirement.
* Please see youth pages question 4 and 5 for comments on public transport.
* We strongly need a bus route to Chichester.
* But have to be able to have a good service to get back to Westbourne.
* Better public transport to Chichester is needed.
* Many buses now are empty. People do not support them enough.
* A top priority!
* This would cut down traffic.
* ASDA and Chichester and Petersfield and Southbourne – ridiculous time slots with no time to shop
* Yes we need bus taxis.
* Useful but probably only limited take-up.
* Better transport means people can get o better shops and amenities which a village cannot support.
* Without a bus service a lot of us are stuck being unable to get out to the shops etc.
* Shuttle very good idea.
* Many more hours are required.
* I don’t use public transport so cannot comment.
* And Chichester.
* Public transport needs improvement.
* In the early morning and evening to service the station. A route between Havant Bus Station and Chichester Bus Station through Emsworth, Westbourne, Funtington etc, and return via 259 would solve transport problems and do away with other route needs.
* Yes, plus reinstatement of proper service to Chichester.
* Only if the service is more frequent than at the moment.
* How could this be financed if predominantly used by pensioners with bus passes.
* This would be good for all our elderly.
* Already a limited bus service. So few people use shuttle services it would not be financially viable. It takes less than 15 minutes to walk.
* Again without own transport the bus service is very limited.
* I moved into the area from a rural village which lost its bus route: only to find that days after I arrived the same thing happened here.
* Shuttle to Emsworth to connect with 700 Coastline would be excellent.
* Good idea.
* Again a way of reducing traffic and parking demand.
* Shuttle to Emsworth is a good idea, especially with a stop at the station, if there’s a good shuttle back as well.
* Good for old people.
* It is currently not possible to use public transport to commute to work. ( 9-5.)
* At this time there is no bus to Emsworth on a Saturday.
* Most important.
* Bus stops kept clear of parking.
* A return of No 11 Bus service would be a good idea.
* A service allowing 5 hours in Chichester would be used by me.
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| 12 | **The provision of a bus shelter** |
| * In The Square this could be incorporated in other changes as above, but there are other bus stops too, Maybe we should look at locations of bus stops?
* What buses in the day?
* As long as it does not block the windows of the shops and houses. It must be positioned to offer the most protection from the prevailing wind, i.e. not like the Lumley Broad shelter in Emsworth.
* Yes, if it is robust and stylish.
* You would have to widen the footpaths.
* Better bus service overall than bus-shelter.
* A canopy in the Square?
* Good idea.
* This would become a maintenance problem and visually unsatisfactory.
* Perhaps something to fit more appropriately with the village character.
* Perhaps it would be a good thing to bring a bus shelter for those waiting for buses.
* Yes. With so many OAPs catching buses and no bus shelters, shows how much the older generation are thought off.
* Must be in keeping with village character.
* Yes.
* Nice idea.
* Good idea but then people would complain of it being “miss-used”. (Am I too cynical?)
* Would make more people feel like waiting for the transport.
* Nice but not essential as services are restricted and often no one waiting in the Square.
* Wooden. Not in the centre of the Square.
* Where?
* Nice wooden one please.
* If it is not too ugly.
* In the Square two will be necessary.
* Which bus stop?
* But done in a sympathetic way.
* Why? This would probably be only one and for the few buses there and would serve little purpose.
* Not sure that it would be worthwhile for the amount of use it would properly get and might encourage miss-use.
* If there are more buses (shuttle to Emsworth).
* Unnecessary expense – use an umbrella.
* Overhang of buildings mostly sufficient.
* Can’t imagine why there isn’t one.
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| 13 | **A Community Car Transport Scheme** |
| * A good idea – even a car-share club might be possible. But how to make it work?
* We have Ems Valley Transport.
* Enable the infirm and elderly to attend appointments, shop and go to the library. It could just be a lift to the 700 or the younger to a job/interview/ sports occasion.
* No - it will probably be abused.
* This for “shuttle” to and from Emsworth.
* Excellent idea for elderly people to use.
* I believe there should be such a scheme but it is dependent on willing volunteers.
* But I doubt its viability.
* Centrally organised.
* There will be no need if there were better provision of public transport.
* EMS Valley community transport caters for those unable to use public transport and has for 17 years. More drivers welcome.
* EVCT already exists for people who need it at a cost to themselves.
* Already in service?
* EVCT already in place. But it is bookable.
* Not sure what this is?
* There is one! More publicity needed.
* Nice idea – shouldn’t need a NP though – more community spirit.
* A lot of people have no cars or are elderly so it would be a good idea.
* A very sensible idea.
* Is this not already in place?
* Share/hire electric car club scheme.
* Not sure what that is.
* If someone can be found to run it.
* If it’s voluntary.
* Don’t we have one?
* Very limited use.
* Great idea for the elderly residents.
* A qualified answer: would become important if Westbourne lost its surgery.
* Would it work – cost.
* Difficult to achieve but logical given the number of commuters to eg: Portsmouth.
* There is the Ems. Comm. Transport (mainly for medical appts. etc) which is excellent but one for shopping would be good. Is this envisaged for hospital visits etc or general. If the latter than a better bus service would be preferable.
* Surely there is one already.
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| 14 | **More local access to the A27** |
| * A junction at Hambrook would serve proposed new developments there, and relieve pressure of traffic passing through Westbourne.
* How? More traffic using this scheme. Not a good idea.
* We don’t wish to encourage more cars to drive through the village.
* No – this wold increase traffic.
* Will encourage more through traffic.
* This would increase the traffic in Westbourne.
* Depending on access point.
* Where?
* Danger of creating a rat-run.
* This would bring more traffic into the village.
* An access point at Southbourne would help.
* This would likely create rat run.
* It would lead to more traffic in the village.
* Danger and increased traffic through Whitechimney Row.
* We are a village, not a through fare.
* Could create as many problems as it would solve – rat runs.
* This would only encourage people to use Westbourne as a rat run.
* What for?
* Would give way to more traffic through the village and not a good idea.
* Emsworth people who want to go East drive through Westbourne. Please discourage this by diverting up the Horndean Road and Common road; as proposed when traffic priority was changed on New Brighton Road.
* Not required.
* If this were to take traffic from the centre of the village then - yes.
* Road at top of Monk’s hill is a rat run and accident risk. This should be addressed.
* Because it would mean more Greenfield space being destroyed. Eg: concrete and tarmac.
* That would make the volume of through traffic even worse.
* Where?
* Would be nice but not essential.
* Would be disastrous!
* Interesting – more access may increase traffic through the village enormously.
* No - will bring more cars through the village.
* Is this necessary?
* No, otherwise there would be too much traffic.
* We have to suffer the road we paid for. But we cannot use it daily as there is no access.
* No new roads.
* That will encourage more housing.
* This will only increase traffic through the village.
* Could mean more traffic/ rat runs.
* East/West junction at Stein Road/ Old Farm Lane.
* Cars again. There’s more to life than cars.
* There’s one in Emsworth.
* Isn’t it easy enough to get to now? Any additional line would mean more traffic.
* If this would reduce through traffic.
* Access is reasonable at Havant and Chichester and it would involve a massive road works.
* Would increase traffic through village.
* If it diverts through traffic away from the village.
* For example?
* Might bring more traffic from the A27.
* Could be one at Southbourne.
* Inevitably increase traffic volume
* This would increase traffic through the village from outlying villages. The main conurbations are the ends of the by-pass. We do NOT need access in the middle.
* We already have access within a few miles.
* It would bring more traffic through the village.
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