

**Westbourne Parish Council, 9 March 2023**

**Agenda item 9: Consultation responses on proposed changes to Whitechimney Row and East Street**

Full consultation details are available at <http://www.westbourne-pc.gov.uk/VirDir/CoreContents/News/Display.aspx?id=55524>

**1. Whitechimney Row**

1.	Concerns about more bollards at the junction of East Street and Whitechimney Row as cars would not be able to park on the verge and they would be further into the road which can cause difficulties for the resident when exiting the drive due to the position of the pedestrian crossing point in the middle of the road. This is directly opposite the drive and if cars are parked the vehicle cannot always go around in one go, requiring the resident to reverse, sometimes, into traffic.
2.	In favour, especially if any means of reducing the speed of vehicles exiting the village along Old Farm Lane. Many cars accelerate at great speeds which is dangerous. Also, to encourage drivers not to throw their rubbish out of the window. Possible new signage about not dropping litter to help with this.
3.	<p>Thank you for the notice about traffic issues in Whitechimney Row and East Street. We are most grateful to the Parish council for its consideration of these issues and support all the measures suggested in the letter from Richard Hitchcock.</p> <p>In recent years we have seen the traffic density increase markedly on Whitechimney Row. I think that having the 20/30mph sign in its current position means that the north side of it becomes the area for either acceleration or deceleration and hence speeds closer to 30 than 20. Provision for pedestrians in that area is inadequate and I'm sure the time is soon coming when we have a serious 'accident' involving either a dog or a child. The poor visibility there means I guess drivers start to think about the possibility of oncoming traffic but not about a young cyclist, a mother with an errant child or a less mobile pensioner with a dog.</p>
4.	I am sending this email in support of the proposed changes to Whitechimney Row and East Street in Westbourne. With Whitechimney Row, I have lost count the amount of times I have been forced to reverse to allow large vehicles through there. I believe a chicane could put paid to this problem with traffic being forced to give way. I also agree with all the other proposals put forward for this area.

5. Thank you for your letter dated January 2023 relating to the above consultation. As a resident of White Chimney Row and regular user of East Street at peak times I am keen to pass on my thoughts and feedback on the proposals.

### **White Chimney Row**

In responding to this I will address this in three parts; speed, width of highway and HGVs.

**Speed.** I was very much an advocate and vocal supporter of the '20 is Plenty' campaign and genuinely hoped it would have the desired effect of slowing down traffic, particularly on White Chimney Row. Sadly, as there is no enforcement of this reduced speed limit, those drivers intent on using this lane as a race track continue to do so unchecked, particularly travelling south out of the village. I have lost count of the number of near misses and screeching brakes we hear as they encounter another car on the blind bend halfway down the lane by our house. I feel sure it is only the presence of the lamppost in this area that has prevented us from having a car in our living room on more than one occasion. With the greatest respect, the speed limit could be reduced to 5mph with signage every few metres but with little to no enforcement it is largely irrelevant to those so inclined. Perhaps rather than employing a parking enforcement officer, the Parish Council could instead put those resources to better use in enforcing the speed limit.

Oddly enough, this inappropriate speed is almost exclusive to White Chimney Row, as all other through routes in the village are essentially single alternate lane traffic by virtue of managed on-street parking, food for thought perhaps?

**Width.** As you will no doubt be very aware, the width of the northernmost section of White Chimney Row varies greatly along its length, ranging between 5.2 and 5.3 metres between structural walls at the pinch points at either end of the lane to almost 6.5 metres to the white line at its widest point outside of our house, "Timbers", immediately north of the narrowest point. I thought it best to illustrate this by way of a series of marked up photographs (please see attached). As you can see, even with a vehicle parked outside the few houses on the lane that do so on occasion, this still doesn't reduce the available width of the road to that of the pinch points at either end and in fact the presence of occasional parked cars actually contributes to slowing traffic down to a far more acceptable speed as experienced elsewhere in the village.

According to DfT's Manual for Streets, in order to create a safe and appropriate pedestrian route along the length of the northernmost section of White Chimney Row, would entail a minimum width of 1200mm being reserved as a footway. (I note that *Inclusive Mobility* suggests a wider minimum of 2000mm for footways.) If a constant 1200mm were to be reserved for pedestrian/shared use and enforcement action taken to keep it clear, then this would reduce the available

	<p>road to vehicles to 4m at its narrowest and therefore inevitably one-way only, and at an already reduced visibility bend. Further physical measures to separate inbound and outbound traffic well before this corner, with priority given to outbound traffic, would be essential to avoid head-on collisions or 'Mexican stand-offs' occurring on a regular basis at peak times with resultant grid-lock. It would also do nothing to prevent those drivers who appear to see a clear road as a challenge. Most weekends and evenings we witness cars going south down the lane at speeds of 50-60 miles per hour! This is not hyperbole, I will happily provide the wine and nibbles if members of the Parish Council wish to sit in my lounge to witness Westbourne's answer to Santa Pod on a Saturday afternoon and evening.</p> <p>My recommendation would be to encourage <i>more</i> on-street parking in appropriate spaces outside of dwellings, the length of this section of White Chimney Row, as it is in The Grove, thus ensuring that speeds are naturally reduced by this section of one-way traffic, with drivers heading north into the village from Southbourne encouraged to give way to those leaving the village to the south, thus ensuring that any congestion at the junction of East Street and White Chimney Row during the peak school run clears quickly.</p> <p><b>HGVs.</b> To your point on the restriction of non-essential HGVs, I welcome this as someone who needs to replace the visibility mirror allowing me to safely exit my driveway on a blind corner with frustrating frequency due to it being impacted by HGV mirrors. It can only be HGVs, as it is mounted far higher than the wing mirrors of even the largest van. However, the two regular culprits that cause most of the congestion and damage on White Chimney Row would both claim to have essential business in the village and therefore any restriction would not apply; those being the Co-Op delivery lorry, often a 40 foot articulated lorry and the single decker buses out of service but heading from their depot in Southbourne onto the start of their route. Either one of these coupled with a school run to the Bourne has the capacity to lock up the area for 20-25 minutes. Again the invitation is there for Parish Council members to join me in my house in the morning, with perhaps coffee rather than wine, to observe the mayhem that occurs regularly when these large HGVs try to squeeze up the lane. You would also observe the vast majority of young people travelling to school by car with no more than a handful choosing to walk or cycle, even in the height of summer.</p>
6.	<p>Thank you for the consultation document regarding the above. We welcome any measures that make life along our village streets safer and more pleasant for all users and value the focus on White Chimney Row (WCR) in particular, as we have all lived there for many years and use it regularly both on foot, cycle and car. There are several aspects of this proposal that we agree with and others we feel would be detrimental and counterproductive to the overall aims.</p> <p><b>White Chimney Row</b></p>

Having lived on White Chimney Row for many years we would concur that traffic has increase and the current 20mph limit is rarely abided by and never enforced. Although renewing roundels is wise, we do not believe anything other than a physical 'restraint' will have significant impact. There have been several 'proposals' in the past, including speed bumps and one way access, which have all come to nothing. There have been several road traffic incidents in recent years, both in and out-bound, with a recent collision with a telegraph pole, which can clearly be seen leaning by the wall of The Lawn. Moving the 20mph zone further along the road or introducing a chicane or restriction table *may* help.

There are several reasons why we feel the proposed alteration to the white edging is both unnecessary and will be detrimental:

- With regard to parking along the roadside, which had increased over recent years as households expanded, we do not believe this to be an issue and believe it actually slows traffic considerably as individual vehicles needs to give way - see image. It has never been a problem for delivery lorries, busses or tractors from passing here, and with respect, the occasional closure of the A27 this is of minimal relevance. If anything the total gridlock makes the traffic extremely slow and thus very safe for pedestrians!
- The natural pinch points are between Drounces and the front gate to The Lawn, where to road is ~4.7m wide ( this is wider than the road outside Cedar Cottage with a car parked across the front and over the edge line currently) and opposite Timbers/Tibbalds Mead. This affects traffic and pedestrians in both directions and it certainly an area of increased hazard.
- Having the occasional parked car between these pinch points in fact slows traffic as they approach, hence increasing safety for all users.
- The single white line along the side of WCR certainly does not provide any sort of safe walking for pedestrians, nor would it if repainted - it is not a pavement and if cars are given a free right they will ignore it.
- The current area between the white edge line and houses would need to be nearer 1.5m wide in order to make any impact, which would take up almost a third of the road in its narrowest points.
- If you are assuming the white edging *may* provide some kind of pedestrian zone, it is on the wrong side of the road for walkers outgoing, at the most critical areas where the pinch points and blind bends are located.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most roads in Westbourne are in essence one-way due to parked cars e.g. The Grove or East Street. Although cars could pass perfectly safely on these an etiquette has built up where drivers give way. The same should be the case on WCR and it should not be made into a clear race track, with absolutely no trigger nor incentive to abide by speed limits. Ian Taylor recalls a very similar plan in the village of his childhood where removal of on street parking simply resulted in heavier traffic of larger vehicles and faster traffic speeds.</li> <li>• Residents need to leave their rubbish bins out, so at least weekly there are physical restrictions along WCR and these will need to continue.</li> <li>• Residents, delivery vehicles and trades need to park outside the houses, even for relatively short periods, and any alteration of this would be extremely inconvenient for all concerned and add to parking pressure in other village areas.</li> <li>• The simple fact is that it is WCR is not designed for motor vehicles. Having two-way traffic and pedestrians sharing this space will inevitably be tight and all need to take care.</li> </ul>
7.	<p>I was reading you Highways Consultation on the above, published 31 January 2023. I feel that these major issues are long overdue for attention.</p> <p>Whitechimney Row is becoming a serious hazard with the speed people think is safe to drive through the narrowed section. The road could do with further priority restriction to only allow one car through at a time. It is only a matter of time before a property gets hit and serious injuries happen. Westbourne is one of the pretty West Sussex villages but is in serious need of “tidying up” with vehicle restrictions and proper parking and general cleaning up of the main streets and Square areas. Westbourne has some good amenities and shops, with better parking and road safety it would encourage more trade and investment for the shops and businesses.</p>
8.	<p>I have been reading your highways consultation published on 31 January 2023 and would like to add my support to the proposals. I was born in Westbourne and, although I currently live outside the village, I have always lived locally my whole life. Whitechimney Row has always been dangerous for pedestrians as I know having walked down that road on numerous occasions. The illegal parking in East Street is also a problem. I often visit a friend in the area and people parking half on the pavement overhanging the double yellow lines at either end of the street not only make it difficult to pass as a pedestrian but also make it difficult for larger vehicles such as vans and lorries to pass. I have witnessed on</p>

	<p>more than one occasion a lorry not being able to pass because of this type of parking, had this been an emergency vehicle (fire engine for example) there is no way they would have been able to pass. I therefore add my support to both proposals.</p>
	<p>We are residents of Whitechimney Row Westbourne and have received the consultation paper about this.</p> <p>We are broadly in support of the Parish Council's proposals for the applications to West Sussex County Council for TROs to improve the traffic problems which we are currently experiencing. We note that the PC has already applied for a restriction on HGVs using the village as a through-way, and the signage and speed restrictions which would follow. We certainly have no objection to the use of a parking enforcement officer, and would welcome any additional funds the PC might glean as a result. We are happy with new bollards, and the repainting of the speed restriction roundels, and a speed restriction table. We are not keen on the idea of a chicane which we feel may make the junction more hazardous; we have in mind that the necessary deliveries to the Co-op may be adversely impacted. We do not wish to discourage the use of the shop which is a valuable resource.</p> <p>On the question of the white line we agree wholeheartedly that this should be made clearer but walking down the Row daily there are two issues which should be addressed first. At the bottom of the Row passing Drounces and Coopers Cottage there is a white line showing the edge of the carriageway. Inside that line, between the tarmac surface and the buildings, there is a significant margin of unsurfaced walkway. This is the only refuge for pedestrians at that point. Can this be addressed by the highway authority thereby giving a greater margin of safety at these points? At the higher part of the Row, passing Tibbalds Mead, at the end of the official footpath, there is a wall. The yew hedge behind it oversails by a significant amount, reducing the effective pavement width and at the end of the pavement forcing pedestrians further into the road very close to a blind bend. We are aware that the property has recently changed hands and it may be that a personal approach by the PC to the new owners to trim this back to the boundary wall could address this.</p> <p>In respect of the proposals for East Street we are again broadly in agreement with the PC's approach. Thank you for advancing these improvements.</p>
9.	<p>Thank you for your paper outlining proposals to improve traffic/parking conditions on White Chimney Row and East Street.</p>

	<p>We live in Cooper's Cottage and are amongst the most adversely affected properties as our house is directly onto the road with no advantage of a pavement. We would welcome any of the suggested improvements to reduce traffic speed and protect pedestrians, but would particularly endorse the introduction of a chicane at the South entrance. We believe that a more physical barrier to reduce speed would have significantly more effect than painting to enforce speed restrictions, although we would endorse this also. Parking needs to be restrained at the junction with East Street as numerous accidents have occurred here over recent years. In addition to new bollards would there be the possibility of double yellow lines to make it clear that parking at the junction is illegal? (When we arrived in Westbourne over forty years ago, a person was killed in a traffic accident in White Chimney Row as a result of which we conducted a petition to close the road to through traffic, suggesting the widening of Cemetery Lane as creating an alternative through-traffic route. Despite gaining significant support in numbers of signatures our suggestion was rejected, nothing was done and White Chimney Row remains dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists. I relate this as potentially relevant to stressing the urgency of the issue.)</p> <p>We convey our thanks to you and Westbourne Parish Council for taking this matter seriously.</p>
10.	<p>As a resident of the property Medlars in Whitechimney Row I would like to take this opportunity to add some comments/suggestions to the proposal. Totally agree to speed/volume/size of traffic is too much for the size of the road. This is particularly noticeably at the end of my drive where there is a pinch point in the road: ie the slight bend in the road meaning drivers can't see around the corner when driving to Southbourne and vis versa. Any traffic travelling too fast use the bottom of my driveway as an escape route to allow oncoming traffic to pass. To illustrate this attached is a photo looking North where the road is only 4.40 metres wide from the white line to the edge of the road outside my property. (The same measurement outside Whitechimney Cottages is 4.90 metres) if traffic going towards Southbourne "meets" oncoming traffic they naturally swerve in to my drive which of course can collide with me if I'm exiting the drive at the same time. We've had some pretty "dirty" looks as drivers think I'm the cause of a potential accident but they are on my property. There is no self-awareness of their driving.</p> <p>The photo also evidences that over time the red brickwork has been hit/scrapped because there is "nowhere to go" which of course is usually down to speeding. Inevitably I've often seen broken wingmirrors. As a consequence, car wheels are breaking up the edge of the road creating potholes which can also be seen in the attached, ( photo taken today ) which brings additional risks to all road users. These potholes are repaired every year by WSCC but frost shattering coupled with traffic erodes the repair. It becomes an annual cycle. Whilst this is not directly relevant, it is a by product of the subject matter. I therefore would be grateful if consideration could be given to perhaps the following :</p>

- \* Priority signage so only one vehicle can pass this stretch of Whitechimney Row. it can be argued it already is when there are larger domestic vehicles
- \* speeding measuring devices like to ones in Foxbury lane
- \* perhaps Glasdon Bollards strategically located outside Tibalds Mead, Medlars & Timbers. Whilst I appreciate they should not be used to potentially increase the risk of accidents the visual deterrent does slow down drivers speed if they think they are going to damage their car.

This small stretch of Whitechimney Row is dangerous and whilst I can't prove this with statistics on near misses I can say with confidence the below.


- \* often we hear brakes been applied sharply so skidding
- \* on a number of occasions ( 3 ) one driver did significant damage by hitting the brick drive wall meaning a 6 feet section had to be repaired, this was simply down to excessive speeding. If there was a pedestrian at the same time the consequences would have been serious. The driver didn't have insurance
- \* I would say any resident of the road would say there's an accident waiting to happen

Thank you for this opportunity and would be grateful if the above could be considered as part of the wider application



11. Thank you for the letter re proposed changes to White chimney row. It's good to see that changes are being considered. I don't think they go far enough.
- The bollards on the verge corner of East St/Whitechimney Row need replacing as these are lightweight and some have been broken.



- Weight and size limit signs on both ends for HGVs
- Replacement more substantial Bollards to protect property and people.
- The walk way is a gods idea but a better idea would be to have the line differentiated and protected by bollards to actually make it safe for pedestrians.
- A white line will not deter a car at speed.
- Small metal bollards would protect both pedestrians and property Like this 

Our house was built in 1760, and the road was there well before cars existed. It is a grade 2 listed - we have to jump through hoops to make changes that are always sympathetic to its history, but is it OK for cars and oversized vehicles to damage it? The bus company (that travels down WCR in large vehicles with toxic fume pumping and are EMPTY!) even said it was our fault for living on the road! I suggest a clean air zone in Westbourne - that would eliminate the oversized lorries and buses and make it safer. Reduce congestion and protect our residents and property.

12. Thank you for looking at these very overdue issues

Re: Whitechimney row, the bottle neck at the north end is pretty dreadful. I believe the stopping of all lorries over a certain weight should be considered here as deliveries to the village are taking place in vehicles that are far in size excess for these roads. The road by "Medlars" is also very narrow and some form of one way traffic chicane should be considered. As we know Whitechimney Row is used as a cut through for a large volume of traffic at rush hour. Our wall and the telegraph pole have been hit several times. There are now 2 cars parked every day on the corner of Whitechimney Row and Foxbury lane meaning there is restricted vision coming out of our driveway at "the Lawn". They regularly extend into our driveway to squeeze 2 vehicles in here restricting access. Cars come around this corner at significant speed and if the vehicle has only moderate height we are unable to see them. There is now a commercial waste vehicle (RS Waste) being parked daily at the North End of Whitechimney Row or on Foxbury Lane. This is totally unsuitable parking for a vehicle that should be in a commercial area but is clearly used for commuting. Please consider there should be a no U-turn sign at the top of East Street/Whitechimney Row to prevent cars turning in the middle of the Highway around the bollards. They regularly hit the bollards in doing so and are obstructed by parked cars

There is an overall fundamental problem of not enough parking in the village meaning residents are forced to park in totally unsuitable places. Some plan for extra off road spaces needs to be considered in the long term plan particularly if further development takes place. Housing needs proper infrastructure. Thanks for your consideration

13. In regard to your recent letter dated January 2023.

The role of the “white line” on White Chimney Row, is at best ambiguous, if not actively unsafe. To pedestrians it suggests (as you apparently do too) that they should walk in the gutter, even though there is sometime no physical space, and footing can be unstable. For motorists it also suggests that pedestrians have no right to the main roadway, but also acts as a “fog-line”. This takes away some of the ambiguity of where the road edge is and speeds up traffic. They’re a safety feature for higher speed roads certainly, but not 20mph zones. A properly delimited (and surfaced) walkway may be a solution, but would have aesthetic consequences. Perhaps just eliminate all road markings in this section, including the centre line?

Pushing the 20mph zone back Old Farm Lane would make sense, and perhaps relieve some some of the sign overload currently (see attached photo) so that more emphasis can be put on the “shared road” section?

Living on White Chimney Row, I’m not convinced that that many LGVs use Westbourne as a cut through, and it would be difficult to prove if they were. (Can GPS systems be compulsory programmed to stop this?). Anyway, larger vehicles do have a traffic calming/slowing effect, making the village an unpredictable cut-through route for cars. Too many of your proposals appears to be predicated on making car trips “faster” through the village? A chicane would slow/reduce traffic on White Chimney Row, but it’s nature and location could be a moot point- perhaps one for the traffic engineers! I think further changes need to be made to the signage... unless the county is planning to dual WCR? PS. There is no signage southbound on Whitechimney Row regarding sharing the road with pedestrians.



Plate used with warning signs where a reduction in speed is necessary



Road narrows on both sides



Road narrows on right (left if symbol reversed)

Plates used with "road narrows" signs



Oncoming vehicles in middle of road



Single file traffic in each direction



Road wide enough for only one line of vehicles



End of dual carriageway



Two-way traffic



Two-way traffic on route crossing ahead

14.

I have worked in a parking service for a local authority for a long time and I can share the following knowledge. The department for transport sets out the parking enforcement regulations in the traffic management act 2004. In order to carryout enforcement of the act, a local authority must apply for delegated authority. Therefore as a local parish you would not be able to apply for these powers. This is covered in section 75 of the TMA 2004. Even if it were possible, you would then need to prove that the person in post was competent, this can only be done by having them do the city and guilds level 2 in parking enforcement. They would also require a uniform that meets the standards set out in the legislation. They would need a handheld computer and printer in order to produce a ticket. There would need to be a approved ticket roll for the penalty charge notice to be printed on. That would then need to go in to an approved envelope to be attached to the vehicle. You would require a approved back office system on which personal details would need to be stored in order for drivers to appeal the ticket and make payment. You wouldn't be able to just have one officer, the health and safety risk is to great for a lone worker with no one else to help them when they require it. It is very common for civil

	<p>enforcement officers to be involved in confrontation and sadly this too often ends in the officer being assaulted or threatened. The Police now a days rarely bother even investigating. You can't really pick and choose days to carryout enforcement, parking is either an issue or it is not. I'm sure we will all agree the lack of consistent enforcement in the village is the issue. The only way this will improve is if Chichester send their civil enforcement officers on a regular basis. Unfortunately this is not likely to happen without consistent pressure being applied, though local Cllrs and MP, along with residents taking the time to report the issues directly. The only way that the village could possibly get a dedicated civil enforcement officer is if you could put in place a deal with Chichester where you fund the wage and they provide the officer. But this is highly unlikely and if it did happen it could possibly be a national first. You are probably aware that some privately owned companies such as NPC carryout parking enforcement. However in the areas they work, they do so as contractors for the local authority using the local authorities previously acquired delegated authority.</p> <p>Whitechimney Row: There is no parking restriction for parking on or inbound of a white line. So the vehicles that currently park on this section of the road will not be in contravention. The only way to stop parking in this section is to apply for a 02 contravention, parked or loading/ unloading in a restricted street where waiting and loading/unloading restrictions are in force. A TRO application for this needs to go to public consultation, often any objections will result in the application being unsuccessful. This is also very costly. I would imagine the residents at this location would object.</p> <p>East Street: The metal railings are unlikely to deter drivers who are already prepared to park on the yellow lines. This is because the drivers side access to the vehicle is not being impeded.</p> <p>I truly appreciate all you are trying to do and I hope that the situation improves, but as I stated above this will only happen through consistent, vigorous enforcement.</p>
15.	<p>I would like to have the following comments noted and considered please. There should be no increased restriction on current legal parking in Westbourne as there are many houses with no off road parking.</p> <p>Whitechimney Row. I agree cars parked across the white lines for long periods of time should be stopped however there should be an allowed off loading time period and for work vans while undertaking work for residents.</p>
16.	<p>We were not surprised to receive the Parish Council letter regarding traffic issues on Whitechimney Row and East Street. It is, alongside speed, absolutely a growing problem in the village.</p>

I am very much in favour of any reasonable measures to improve traffic issues throughout Westbourne, however I believe there are a number of key problems with your proposal. I can speak to these in more detail on Whitechimney Row having lived here for 18 years.

#### Whitechimney Row 'gridlock'

The suggestion that Whitechimney Row is becoming impassable seems at best an exaggeration and at worst completely ill-informed. There have been instances in recent months of increased traffic due to A27 closures. These are rare, and as someone coming and going from Whitechimney Row daily, I can say that even on these days traffic is passable.

Where traffic does build up on Whitechimney Row, this is caused by vehicles waiting to pass on East Street, and rarely caused by blockages on Whitechimney Row itself.

#### 'White lines that marks the safe pedestrian footway'

I believe your letter is misleading in regard to the white line along the side of Whitechimney Row. Single, solid white lines on the edge of roads indicate the edge of the carriageway. They carry no legal status beyond this unless specified within local byelaws and on signage. They certainly do not mark a 'safe pedestrian footway'. I would invite anyone to walk up Whitechimney Row safely staying within this 'safe pedestrian footway'. They will find that the area outside of the carriageway is extremely narrow in parts, worsened around blind corners as you walk out of the village. Difficult or impossible for pedestrians, and out of the question for anyone pushing a pram or walking a dog.

Residents of Whitechimney Row often park outside of their houses, as you say. This has increased as parking in the village becomes increasingly in demand and increasingly limited.

You have not necessarily accounted for the effects of these vehicles along Whitechimney Row. As I have discussed, blind corners along Whitechimney Row do pose a risk to pedestrians, and of course the speed of vehicles is a crucial factor. Cars parked in a few places forces those driving into the village to slow down, and yield to cars leave the village. This decreases the speed of cars entering the village, and therefore the risk to pedestrians walking along the road. The width of carriageway alongside these parked vehicle remains wider than the narrowest sections of the road, and absolutely passable by HGVs and buses.

#### New bollards at the Whitechimney Row/East street junction

I can understand the need to reduce parking on this corner. As I have explained, cars waiting to pass do cause some congestion on Whitechimney Row, although nothing beyond that of any similar village in the area.

I would warn that further limiting parking in the village may lead to more parking in areas currently not an issue.

	<p><u>Broken white line to show a shared footpath/roadway</u>  Further narrowing of Whitechimney Row is ill-thought out. It ignores the needs of residents to pick up / drop off, and the at least weekly presence of bins along the road. It will also mean that cars are stopping and moving out around people, as opposed to parked cars. This seems to only add increased risk and a false sense of security to pedestrians, whilst needlessly impeding on those living along Whitechimney Row.</p> <p><u>Suggestions</u>  Traffic is absolutely an issue in Westbourne, as is the speed of some vehicles through the village. However, these issues are worsening largely as a result of factors outside of Westbourne. Growing areas of housing and an increasing local population is increasing the demand on all local roads.  New 20mph signs and roundels are a good way to reduce speed through the village. However, please consider the impact that cars parked along Whitechimkney Row have in slowing traffic.  I believe other suggestions, as I have detailed above, are somewhat short-sighted and fail to consider the underlying issue. Whitehimney Row is an ancient road, it is narrow, and not built for the movement of modern vehicles. A completely safe walkway is not possible along such a rural road, nor is it common on many comparable roads in the local area. Completely changing the use of the road for residents in the pursuit of a safe passageway does not seem to be the best approach, and appears to be a very expensive way of narrowing the road further, without having a meaningful impact.</p>
--	---

## 2. East Street

1.	In favour of proposed changes. Would like bollards on the opposite side of the road as well to protect properties which are straight onto the road
2.	The traffic down the one way system has certainly increased over the years. Cars parking on the narrow pavement (and on yellow lines) cause not only damage to kerb and pavement but also obstructing traffic. White vans, delivery vans etc obstruct buses and larger vehicles trying to drive down the one way system. With vehicles parked illegally on the pavement this also hinders using the pavement for prams, pushchairs, pedestrians etc along the narrowest part of the path. Some Homeowners on East Street also find themselves walking out of their front doors only to be obstructed by vehicles parking too close the houses. I strongly agree to the proposals put forward for bollards to be placed to prevent illegal parking on the yellow lines and pavement. Widening of the pavement is beneficial for the safety of pedestrians who currently have to step into the road to get around the vehicles parked illegally.

3.	<p>I am sending this email in support of the proposed changes to Whitechimney Row and East Street in Westbourne. The illegal parking in East Street is a danger to pedestrians, residents and traffic passing through. Any actions taken to stop this and make it a safer area gets my support.</p>
4.	<p>Regarding the proposed changes in the letter dated January 2023 my wife &amp; I are in full agreement to the proposed changes, we have owned Lilliput Cottage 5 East Street for 4 1/2 years now &amp; though understand fully the issues that arise with a village such as Westbourne have found both the Highways &amp; Chichester Councils lack of action to the continuing issues we have extremely frustrating &amp; demoralising. For as long as we've lived there the pathing has been cracked &amp; left in a sub standard state, regularly have an issue with cars parked on the pavement immediately outside our house. Quite often the are parked as close as two feet from our front door which as you can imagine is a huge inconvenience getting in and out, we know find ourselves having to be extremely vigilant when exiting our property due to the frequency of cars driving onto the pavement. We especially have to be cautious when taking our dog out. Unfortunately just recently one of our elderly neighbours tripped over because of one of the broken slabs &amp; severely injured her face when falling, I'm surprised this had not happened more to be honest &amp; think the council should be grateful she did not wish to make it known due to her embarrassment. We have also noticed damage to our property now which quite possibly due to the larger traffic &amp; parked cars on the the pavement which we will need to get repaired, the little one way street was never meant for the size of vehicles that come down there or the pavement being driven on and neither was our house due to the fact it is almost 350 years old &amp; a listed building. I would imagine if I was damaging the property the council would be very much interested then &amp; be knocking on my door. I rather hope something might eventually get done but if I'm honest the lack of action over the last 4 1/2 years would lead me to think this is all just another exercise to try to quieten the inhabitants of the village for a number of years again.</p> <p>I have attached a few pictures of the cracks that have appeared down the front of our house.</p>
5.	<p>Thank you for your letter dated January 2023 relating to the above consultation. As a resident of White Chimney Row and regular user of East Street at peak times I am keen to pass on my thoughts and feedback on the proposals.</p> <p><b>East Street</b></p> <p>Your proposals sound eminently sensible to me, particularly the installation of physical measures to prevent parking on the pavement and the widening of this well used footway.</p> <p>In summary, it is quite evident that our lovely village was never designed with cars and HGVs in mind, with many of the pinch points bounded by heritage assets being woefully too narrow for two way traffic of any speed, and a large proportion</p>

	<p>of the dwellings in the village centre having no off-street parking. That said, by fortunate coincidence, the solution to one challenge has neatly assisted in resolving the other. With most routes through the village rendered single lane through permitted on-street parking, slowing traffic down to a polite 'after you' policy. I implore the Parish Council to extend this natural traffic calming to White Chimney Row thus solving some of the parking pressures of residents that inevitably impact on East Street and removing the personal race-track of those so inclined.</p>
6.	<p>Regarding widen the path along East Street, you may want to talk to the owner of the petrol station, as he hears arguments all the time, this is due to the road being too narrow, if anything the path on the petrol station side needs to be narrowed so 2 cars can flow through the village without all the congestion we get at times. If you worried about people speeding, put speed humps. Widen the path is a bad idea!</p>
7.	<p>Thank you for the consultation document regarding the above. We welcome any measures that make life along our village streets safer and more pleasant for all users and value the focus on White Chimney Row (WCR) in particular, as we have all lived there for many years and use it regularly both on foot, cycle and car. There are several aspects of this proposal that we agree with and others we feel would be detrimental and counterproductive to the overall aims.</p> <p><b>East Street</b></p> <p>This is not an area that affect us quite so acutely, but similarly the extension of double yellow lines as proposed would again result in a clear thoroughfare and encourage faster traffic. We would love to be able to manage without cars and indeed we do walk and cycle regularly, but cars are a fact of life and we can use them to slow other road uses, not banish them and create a race track. We are more than happy to speak to the PC directly to explain our views further if you so wish.</p>
8.	<p>I was reading you Highways Consultation on the above, published 31 January 2023. I feel that these major issues are long overdue for attention. East Street one way section. This is another area where a serious accident is likely to take place. I am a disabled pensioner with serious spinal issues and foot injury which cause me balance issues. Firstly the pavement is extremely uneven and a trip hazard with the added danger of vehicles being parked up on the pavement, anyone with a pushchair, wheelchair, mobility scooter and even bags of shopping, has to step into the road to get around these parked vehicles - bad enough if it's a car but even worse if it's commercial vehicles making deliveries. As with Whitechimney Row, vehicles speed through East Street unaware of potential dangers, even oncoming vehicles who have missed the one way signs. There is also the additional issue of parking on the corner by Spice Cottage. This makes turning out of the street dangerous as they obstruct the vision of vehicles coming from the left.</p>



	<p>Westbourne is one of the pretty West Sussex villages but is in serious need of “tidying up” with vehicle restrictions and proper parking and general cleaning up of the main streets and Square areas. Westbourne has some good amenities and shops, with better parking and road safety it would encourage more trade and investment for the shops and businesses.</p>
9.	<p>I would like to say that I fully agree with the proposed changes to the one-way section of East Street. My daughter lives at April Cottage, which is next to the Indian Restaurant, and on several occasions when visiting her I have been unable to access the lock on the front door due to the vehicles parking so close to the cottage on the pavement. I expect wheelchairs and buggy’s having to use the road to get past. This could also endanger life if there was a fire in her cottage my daughter would not be able to exit by the front door.</p> <p>An incident happened in 2021 while my daughter was away when a van mounted on the pavement outside her cottage caught fire, the fire burnt her side gate and wall but this could have been a lot worse, another incident happened when a tall furniture van was delivering and mounted the pavement half way across the front of her cottage and as it pulled away it damaged her roof with the top of the lorry, luckily all particulars were taken and she was recompensed, but if not the damage would have been down to her.</p> <p>I think in these times that the measures you propose need to be taken so that the beautiful village of Westbourne is kept beautiful.</p>
10.	<p>I am writing in regards to the current problems and solutions required for the one way road in Westbourne between the residential properties and Stags Head public house.</p> <p>As a local resident I can say that this road is always horrific. Cars are continuously parked on the pavements or blocking the road, making it increasingly difficult to drive through. If visiting anyone within the residential area, if cars are parked half on the pavement it is very difficult and dangerous to walk along the pavement area, especially a year ago after a total knee replacement, and after visiting the local surgery and then wanting to visit a friend, with parking throughout the road and pavement makes it impossible.</p> <p>I hope to see massive improvements going forward to make this easier for us all in the area, including limitations as to where people can park, and speed limits implemented.</p>
11.	<p>I have been reading your highways consultation published on 31 January 2023 and would like to add my support to the proposals.</p>

	<p>I was born in Westbourne and, although I currently live outside the village, I have always lived locally my whole life. Whitechimney Row has always been dangerous for pedestrians as I know having walked down that road on numerous occasions.</p> <p>The illegal parking in East Street is also a problem. I often visit a friend in the area and people parking half on the pavement overhanging the double yellow lines at either end of the street not only make it difficult to pass as a pedestrian but also make it difficult for larger vehicles such as vans and lorries to pass. I have witnessed on more than one occasion a lorry not being able to pass because of this type of parking, had this been an emergency vehicle (fire engine for example) there is no way they would have been able to pass. I therefore add my support to both proposals.</p>
12.	<p>I am a resident near East Street and regularly get caught down this road due to accessibility issues. I have also seen people struggle to get past on foot due to cars on the pavements. I agree with widening the path and putting up the metal barriers.</p>
13.	<p>I have worked in a parking service for a local authority for a long time and I can share the following knowledge. The department for transport sets out the parking enforcement regulations in the traffic management act 2004. In order to carryout enforcement of the act, a local authority must apply for delegated authority. Therefore as a local parish you would not be able to apply for these powers. This is covered in section 75 of the TMA 2004. Even if it were possible, you would then need to prove that the person in post was competent, this can only be done by having them do the city and guilds level 2 in parking enforcement. They would also require a uniform that meets the standards set out in the legislation. They would need a handheld computer and printer in order to produce a ticket. There would need to be a approved ticket roll for the penalty charge notice to be printed on. That would then need to go in to an approved envelope to be attached to the vehicle. You would require a approved back office system on which personal details would need to be stored in order for drivers to appeal the ticket and make payment. You wouldn't be able to just have one officer, the health and safety risk is to great for a lone worker with no one else to help them when they require it. It is very common for civil enforcement officers to be involved in confrontation and sadly this too often ends in the officer being assaulted or threatened. The Police now a days rarely bother even investigating. You can't really pick and choose days to carryout enforcement, parking is either an issue or it is not. I'm sure we will all agree the lack of consistent enforcement in the village is the issue. The only way this will improve is if Chichester send their civil enforcement officers on a regular basis. Unfortunately this is not likely to happen without consistent pressure being applied, though local Cllrs and MP, along with residents taking the time to report the issues directly. The only way that the village could possibly get a dedicated civil enforcement officer is if you could put in place a deal with Chichester where you fund the wage and they provide the officer. But this is highly unlikely and if it did happen it could possibly be a national first. You are probably aware that some privately owned companies</p>

	<p>such as NPC carryout parking enforcement. However in the areas they work, they do so as contractors for the local authority using the local authorities previously acquired delegated authority.</p> <p>Whitechimney Row: There is no parking restriction for parking on or inbound of a white line. So the vehicles that currently park on this section of the road will not be in contravention. The only way to stop parking in this section is to apply for a TRO application, parked or loading/ unloading in a restricted street where waiting and loading/unloading restrictions are in force. A TRO application for this needs to go to public consultation, often any objections will result in the application being unsuccessful. This is also very costly. I would imagine the residents at this location would object.</p> <p>East Street: The metal railings are unlikely to deter drivers who are already prepared to park on the yellow lines. This is because the drivers side access to the vehicle is not being impeded.</p> <p>I truly appreciate all you are trying to do and I hope that the situation improves, but as I stated above this will only happen through consistent, vigorous enforcement.</p>
14.	<p>I would like to have the following comments noted and considered please. There should be no increased restriction on current legal parking in Westbourne as there are many houses with no off road parking.</p> <p>East Street one way: This should be left as is but the double yellows enforced. Any restrictions could reduce the value of the houses fronting the street in this area which should not be allowed to happen.</p>
15.	<p>I was very pleased to receive your letter regarding the above. I live at 3 Lamb Buildings, East Street and fairly regularly have problems with people parking right outside my lounge window. There is a double yellow line and the road is quite narrow which means that drivers seem to think it's Ok to park on the pavement. I have also seen several vehicles driving up this street the wrong way. I also think the road on the other side going past the co-op should be one way. At the moment people go down that road instead of going down the other side past my house. This causes even more congestion. Surely the traffic would flow more freely if everyone was travelling in one direction. There are cars parked on either side of the street near the co-op which means the road is too narrow for two way traffic. Even though there are double yellow lines on the road people don't seem to take any notice and a parking warden is such a rare thing to see in Westbourne that people don't fear getting caught out.</p> <p>We also seem to get an awful lot of HGV's going through the village these days so I am delighted to hear that you are going to try to sort something out about this.</p>

### 3. Other highways concerns

1.	<p>Parking around Westbourne Primary is getting worse at school dropoff and pickup times. Yesterday as I walked my son to school a parent thought it was acceptable to drive along the footpath towards us in order to park on the grass verge on the corner of Mill Road and River Street.</p> <p>I feel the simple addition of bollards on the junction grass verge would stop this and make the path safer for families walking to school. It is only a matter of time before someone is injured by cars parking on the path and grass.</p>
2.	<p>I only have 2 comments relating to the request for feedback on Highways in Westbourne both of which take a slightly wider view to the local issues.</p> <p>1. COOP - I have always thought that the section in front of the COOP should also be one way with traffic only allowed heading north from the square up North Street with the traffic exit to the square being in front of the curry house on the existing one way road. This would stop congestion in front of the COOP and only make one left or right hand turn into the square. The coop would still be able to load but the lorry would have to exit up north street rather through the square which personally i see as a bad thing.</p> <p>2. Corner of Foxbury and East Street - please can we have some double yellow lines on the corner in front of Mill End House and The Backmalls</p>
3.	<p>I am emailing you about my concerns of the bend coming from westbourne village into Foxbury Lane. Most days there are at least 5 to 6 cars parked along and on the bend of Foxbury making it a safety issue, I'm surprised there hasn't been a serious accident. They also park up on the pavement causing an obstruction to pedestrians, at times you wouldn't get a pushchair past. Is there any thoughts about putting double yellow lines, to stop this?</p>
4.	<p>Thank you very much for the letter inviting comments on the proposed traffic measures for White Chimney Row and the part of The Square leading into East Street. Overall, the proposed measures for improving safety and traffic management are very welcome. I believe they also provide an opportunity to take a wider, 'whole village centre' (WVC) approach. I suggest that the White Chimney/East Street measures are presented as Phase 1 of such a whole village centre traffic management proposal, and that the Phase 1 application for a TRO will, when approved, be followed by Phase 2 after consultation and any necessary expert advice or input from WSCC Highways or others. Phase 2 would be for traffic calming and parking management measures in Westbourne Road, The Grove, The Square, North Street south of the River</p>

	<p>Street junction and the main part of East Street. Speeding and aggressive driving on those roads cause hazards and concern for pedestrians, cyclists (who are often forced on to narrow pavements) and other road users. Traffic calming measures could include the long-planned pedestrian crossing, and at least one chicane elsewhere between The Grove and East Street. Parking measures are more controversial, but would address and seek to balance the needs of residents and of local businesses. Paid-for parking permits for residents (and 'tickets' that could be provided by residents to short-term visitors, including contractors carrying out work on properties) would generate revenue that could offset, or perhaps meet, the cost of additional warden presence or other management or enforcement measures. Other parking places, not immediately in front of residential properties with no off-road parking, could be time-limited in a similar way to the Emsworth arrangements so as to provide legal parking for shoppers and other short-term visitors. They might even be unlimited in time after, say, 18.00 to serve the needs of the pubs and restaurant.</p> <p>I hope the two phase approach would address the wider needs of residents and businesses in te village centre, and that WPC will include provision for that second phase in the phase one TRO submission. If you believe it would help to share this email with WSCC, please feel free to do so.</p>
5.	Another issue is parking outside the George & Dragon surgery. Cannot the surgery be asked/permited to move their parking 1m back to open up The Square to pedestrians?

# Appendix E Project Pro-forma

## Infrastructure categories

Below are the categories to be used in the IDP:

Category	Typology	Provider
Transport	Roads	National Highways (Strategic Road Network)  West Sussex County Council (Local Road Network)
	Bus	Stagecoach Compass Travel West Sussex County Council
	Rail networks	Network Rail Southern (Govia Thameslink) Railway
	Cycling and walking infrastructure	West Sussex County Council Sustrans Chichester District Council
Education	Further Education	Chichester College
	Higher Education	University of Chichester
	Secondary education	West Sussex County Council, Private Schools and Academies Free Schools
	Primary education	West Sussex County Council, Private Schools and Academies Free Schools
	Early Years	West Sussex County Council. Various private nursery & pre-school providers Voluntary sector
	Special Educational Needs	West Sussex County Council
Health	Acute care and general hospitals	Western Sussex Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
	Community and Mental Health facilities	Coastal West Sussex NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
	Primary Care facilities i.e. General Practitioner (GP) practices	Coastal West Sussex NHS Clinical Commissioning Group Various GP surgeries
Social Infrastructure	Social and Community facilities	Parish Councils Private Companies/Organisations

	Built Sports and leisure facilities	Chichester District Council Parish Councils Private Companies
	Built Community facilities	Parish Councils Organisations
Green Infrastructure	Open Spaces, Parks & Playing pitches	Chichester District Council Parish, City & Town Councils Private Companies Educational establishments
	Allotments	Parish, City & Town Councils
	Habitats Regulations Assessment mitigation – interventions necessary to mitigate the effects of development on European-designated conservation sites. In Chichester District these sites are mainly protected through payments (provided through Unilateral Undertakings) for management measures, but they can also be protected by the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGS) provided as on-site mitigation as part of this Plan.	Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership  Chichester District Council & Natural England operating as Bird Aware Solent  Pagham Harbour Mitigation Partnership (between Chichester District Council & Arun District Council) Environment Agency
	Flood defences	Chichester District Council
	Rivers and streams (blue corridors)	Environment Agency  Riparian owners
	Coastal flood defences	Environment Agency Chichester District Council
Public and Community Services	Emergency services - Police	Sussex Police
	Emergency services – Fire & Rescue	West Sussex County Council Fire & Rescue
	Emergency services - Ambulance	South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Trust (SECamb)
	Libraries	West Sussex County Council
	Cemeteries and crematoria	Chichester District Council runs Portfield and Petworth Cemeteries Church owned and run Churchyards Dignity Crematorium (Private Company)
	Waste management and disposal	West Sussex County Council
Utility Services	Wastewater treatment and sewerage	Southern Water
	Water supply	Portsmouth Water Thames Water Southern Water

	Electricity	Scottish & Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE)
	Gas	Scotia Gas Network (SGN)
	Telecommunications/Digital infrastructure	BT Openreach

**Table to be produced for each infrastructure delivery commissioner:**

The information provided will inform future versions of the IDP and will feed into the production of a five-year rolling Infrastructure Business Plan.

Infrastructure Category (from first column in table above)	IBP number if amending an existing project.  If a new project please leave blank	Project title/ description	Justification/ rationale	Date the project is needed, and if to be delivered in phases, dates for each phase	Total estimated infrastructure cost	Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & identification of any shortfalls	Delivery lead (If not your organisation ensure you have discussed this with the project lead and have their firm approval)
Transport		Village car park	In the centre of the village to support businesses, and allow residents/visitors with an alternative place to park, to alleviate pressure on roads caused by parking. Westbourne has very congested roads due to on	2023/27		The Parish Council has an earmarked reserve for this purpose and aims to work with other village organisations.	



			street parking, which is the only option for many, and the volume of traffic travelling through the central roads.				
Transport		Reconfiguration of The Square	Reconfiguration of The Square to allow for a pedestrian crossing, improved car parking, flow of traffic, and help support local businesses and allow for village events. The Square is increasingly congested by parked vehicles and passing traffic. Reconfiguration would support all road users.	2023/27		The Parish Council has an earmarked reserve for this purpose.	
Transport		Speed reduction and highway improvement schemes	Westbourne is experiencing much passing traffic through the main roads due to increase housing locally. A highways plan and improvements are required to	2023/27		The Parish Council has an earmarked reserve for this purpose.	

			outline improvements to road layouts, double yellow lines and bollards to prevent inappropriate parking, restriction of HGVs, speed indicator devices, and support for the Community Speedwatch Group				
Social infrastructure		Storage unit	The Parish Council does not own any premises and storage space is required for its increasing amount of items and facilities which are used for the benefit of the local community.	2023/27		Working in partnership with the Westbourne Community Trust to provide storage facilities for the Council.	
Social infrastructure		CCTV	At Monk's Hill recreation ground car park to prevent anti-social behaviour and fly tipping	2023/27			

			which has increased in recent years.				
Social infrastructure		Westbourne Community Hall, River Street, Westbourne	To support the refurbishment of the building for the benefit of the local community	2022/27			
Green infrastructure		Exercise, sport, play	To create an exercise circuit around the perimeter of the recreation ground at Monk's Hill with a range of exercise equipment.	2023/27			
Green infrastructure		Play/sport equipment	To replace the play/sport equipment at Mill Road recreation ground which has come to the end of its life-span.	2023/27		The Parish Council has set aside an earmarked reserve and is working with Westbourne Community Trust on the project.	
Green infrastructure		Tree planting	To continue to plant trees/hedges across the Parish	2023/27			

Green infrastructure		Environment	To support the River Ems restoration projects to enhance and restore the river and protect it from over abstraction with leads to it drying up in warmer months.	2023/27		Working with the Friends of the Ems, a local community group.	

**Bank Reconciliation Statement as at 28/02/2023  
for Cashbook 1 - Lloyds Bank A/c**

---

<u>Bank Statement Account Name (s)</u>	<u>Statement Date</u>	<u>Page No</u>	<u>Balances</u>
Lloyds Bank A/c	28/02/2023	1	106,238.69
			<hr/> 106,238.69
<u>Unpresented Cheques (Minus)</u>		<u>Amount</u>	
		0.00	
			<hr/> 0.00
			106,238.69
<u>Receipts not Banked/Cleared (Plus)</u>			
		0.00	
			<hr/> 0.00
			106,238.69
		<b>Balance per Cash Book is :-</b>	<b>106,238.69</b>
		<b>Difference is :-</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Time: 14:36

**Bank Reconciliation up to 28/02/2023 for Cashbook No 1 - LLOYds Bank A/c**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Cheque/Ref</u>	<u>Amnt Paid</u>	<u>Amnt Banked</u>	<u>Stat Amnt</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Cleared</u>	<u>Payee Name or Description</u>
07/02/2023	154	330.00		330.00		R <input type="checkbox"/>	DOR-2-DOR
07/02/2023	155	1,425.35		1,425.35		R <input type="checkbox"/>	THE WOODHORN GROUP
10/02/2023	157	1,584.61		1,584.61		R <input type="checkbox"/>	CONFIDENTIAL PAYMENTS
10/02/2023	158	509.70		509.70		R <input type="checkbox"/>	WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
10/02/2023	159	128.57		128.57		R <input type="checkbox"/>	MICROSHADE
10/02/2023	160	9.48		9.48		R <input type="checkbox"/>	MICROSOFT
10/02/2023	161	288.06		288.06		R <input type="checkbox"/>	MONSTER CREATIVE
10/02/2023	161	30.00		30.00		R <input type="checkbox"/>	MONSTER CREATIVE
10/02/2023	162	975.00		975.00		R <input type="checkbox"/>	LONGMEADOWS
13/02/2023	156	18.00		18.00		R <input type="checkbox"/>	EE
		<u>5,298.77</u>	<u>0.00</u>				



Westbourne Parish Council  
 53 SKYLARK AVENUE  
 EMSWORTH  
 HAMPSHIRE  
 PO10 7GB

**Your Account**

**Sort Code** 30-91-97  
**Account Number** 00168407

**TREASURERS ACCOUNT**

01 February 2023 to 28 February 2023

<b>Money In</b>	£0.00	<b>Balance on 01 February 2023</b>	£111,537.46
<b>Money Out</b>	£5,298.77	<b>Balance on 28 February 2023</b>	£106,238.69

**Your Transactions**

Date	Description	Type	Money In (£)	Money Out (£)	Balance (£)
07 Feb 23	DOR-2-DOR 100000001074380550 INV-1202	FPO		330.00	111,207.46
07 Feb 23	THE WOODHORN GROUP 400000001082409824 76271	FPO		1,425.35	109,782.11
10 Feb 23	LONGMEADOWS 400000001083845323 0676	FPO		975.00	108,807.11
10 Feb 23	MONSTER CREATIVE 500000001079051731 007974	FPO		318.06	108,489.05
10 Feb 23	MICROSOFT 600000001078780545	FPO		9.48	108,479.57
10 Feb 23	MICROSHADE 200000001075107790 17329	FPO		128.57	108,351.00
10 Feb 23	WSCC LGPS 100000001075818236 CLARE	FPO		509.70	107,841.30
10 Feb 23	CLARE KENNETT 600000001078780580 SALARY	FPO		1,584.61	106,256.69
13 Feb 23	EE LIMITED Q74144313394971314	DD		18.00	106,238.69

**Transaction types**

<b>BGC</b> Bank Giro Credit	<b>BP</b> Bill Payments	<b>CHG</b> Charge	<b>CHQ</b> Cheque
<b>COR</b> Correction	<b>CPT</b> Cashpoint	<b>DD</b> Direct Debit	<b>DEB</b> Debit Card
<b>DEP</b> Deposit	<b>FEE</b> Fixed Service	<b>FPI</b> Faster Payment In	<b>FPO</b> Faster Payment Out
<b>MPI</b> Mobile Payment In	<b>MPO</b> Mobile Payment Out	<b>PAY</b> Payment	<b>SO</b> Standing Order
<b>TFR</b> Transfer			

## Detailed Receipts &amp; Payments by Budget Heading 28/02/2023

## Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>100 Income</u>							
1076 Precept	115,437	115,437	0			100.0%	
1080 Bank Interest	478	0	(478)			0.0%	
1090 Misc Income	240	0	(240)			0.0%	
1100 Access licence - Mill Road	0	50	50			0.0%	
1110 Access licence - Sydenham Terr	200	200	0			100.0%	
1120 Rent - Allotment Association	500	500	0			100.0%	
1200 Grants Received	512	0	(512)			0.0%	
Income :- Receipts	<b>117,367</b>	<b>116,187</b>	<b>(1,180)</b>			<b>101.0%</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Net Receipts</b>	<b>117,367</b>	<b>116,187</b>	<b>(1,180)</b>				
<u>110 General Admin &amp; Disbursements</u>							
4000 Clerk's Salary - Gross	21,003	22,500	1,497		1,497	93.3%	
4010 Employers National Insurance	1,591	1,895	304		304	84.0%	
4030 Employers Pension	4,406	4,550	144		144	96.8%	
4060 Travelling (Clerk)	11	75	64		64	14.4%	
4065 Home Used as Office	286	320	34		34	89.4%	
4070 Chairman's Expenses	38	0	(38)		(38)	0.0%	9
4075 Councillor's Expenses	7	0	(7)		(7)	0.0%	
4080 Courses & Publications	731	500	(231)		(231)	146.1%	
4085 External Audit	400	400	0		0	100.0%	
4090 Internal Audit	353	400	47		47	88.3%	
4095 Legal Advice & Professional	105	2,000	1,895		1,895	5.3%	
4100 Planning Consultant	1,099	4,000	2,901		2,901	27.5%	
4105 Information Commissioner Offic	35	35	0		0	100.0%	
4110 Insurance	0	1,500	1,500		1,500	0.0%	
4115 Rialtas Financial Software	649	1,000	351		351	64.9%	
4120 Cloud Doc Storage/MS 365	1,267	870	(397)		(397)	145.7%	
4125 Hall Hire /Zoom Meeting Expens	412	500	88		88	82.4%	
4130 Stationery / Printing	378	200	(178)		(178)	189.1%	
4135 Postage / Po Box Address	323	320	(3)		(3)	101.0%	
4140 Mobile Phone	300	300	(0)		(0)	100.0%	
General Admin & Disbursements :- Indirect Payments	<b>33,394</b>	<b>41,365</b>	<b>7,971</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,971</b>	<b>80.7%</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Net Payments</b>	<b>(33,394)</b>	<b>(41,365)</b>	<b>(7,971)</b>				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	9						
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>(33,385)</b>						



## Detailed Receipts &amp; Payments by Budget Heading 28/02/2023

## Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<b>120 Running Costs</b>							
4200 Westbourne Cemetery	11,155	11,155	0		0	100.0%	
4205 Ground Maintenance - Monks Hill	8,219	6,850	(1,369)		(1,369)	120.0%	
4210 Drainage Work - Monks Hill	8,210	3,000	(5,210)		(5,210)	273.7%	
4215 Ground Maintenance - Mill Road	7,169	7,900	731		731	90.7%	
4220 Playground Defib Inspections	1,415	2,300	885		885	61.5%	
4225 Playground Inspections	625	1,200	575		575	52.1%	
4230 Footway Lighting Maintenance	1,254	1,300	46		46	96.4%	
4235 Rent to CDC - Mill Road Field	0	100	100		100	0.0%	
4705 Plant /Soil Flower Troughs	102	50	(52)		(52)	204.4%	
Running Costs :- Indirect Payments	<b>38,149</b>	<b>33,855</b>	<b>(4,294)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(4,294)</b>	<b>112.7%</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Net Payments</b>	<b>(38,149)</b>	<b>(33,855)</b>	<b>4,294</b>				
<b>130 Subscriptions, S137 / S147</b>							
4300 Membership WSALC / NALC	0	770	770		770	0.0%	
4305 Local Council Review Qtr Mag	0	17	17		17	0.0%	
4310 Clerk's Membership SLCC	222	215	(7)		(7)	103.3%	
4315 British Legion Poppy Appeal	65	65	0		0	100.0%	
4320 Westbourne Allotment Associat	50	50	0		0	100.0%	
4325 Closed Churchyard	200	200	0		0	100.0%	
4330 Homestart	250	250	0		0	100.0%	
4335 Citizens Advice	300	300	0		0	100.0%	
4340 Parish Online Subscription	75	50	(25)		(25)	150.0%	25
4345 Community Chest Grants	500	500	0		0	100.0%	
Subscriptions, S137 / S147 :- Indirect Payments	<b>1,662</b>	<b>2,417</b>	<b>755</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>755</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Net Payments</b>	<b>(1,662)</b>	<b>(2,417)</b>	<b>(755)</b>				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	25						
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>(1,637)</b>						
<b>140 Capital Schemes</b>							
4400 Play Equipment - Monks Hill	0	3,000	3,000		3,000	0.0%	
4410 Churchyard Wall	5,138	10,000	4,862		4,862	51.4%	
4425 Office Equipment	79	0	(79)		(79)	0.0%	
4430 Tree Survey/Surgery	566	500	(66)		(66)	113.3%	
4440 Defibrillators	589	200	(389)		(389)	294.5%	
4455 Community Bus Service	2,000	2,000	0		0	100.0%	
4465 National Commemorations /Celeb	2,271	500	(1,771)		(1,771)	454.2%	1,771
Capital Schemes :- Indirect Payments	<b>10,644</b>	<b>16,200</b>	<b>5,556</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,556</b>	<b>65.7%</b>	<b>1,771</b>
<b>Net Payments</b>	<b>(10,644)</b>	<b>(16,200)</b>	<b>(5,556)</b>				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	1,771						
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>(8,873)</b>						

## Detailed Receipts &amp; Payments by Budget Heading 28/02/2023

## Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>150 Services</u>							
4500 Footway Lighting Energy SSE	2,464	2,000	(464)		(464)	123.2%	
4505 Waste Bins & Emptying	1,336	1,600	264		264	83.5%	
Services :- Indirect Payments	<b>3,800</b>	<b>3,600</b>	<b>(200)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(200)</b>	<b>105.5%</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Net Payments</b>	<b>(3,800)</b>	<b>(3,600)</b>	<b>200</b>				
<u>160 Communications</u>							
4445 Noticeboards	5,263	0	(5,263)		(5,263)	0.0%	5,263
4600 Community Consultation	30	250	220		220	12.0%	
4605 Newsletter /Printing Communica	2,490	2,000	(490)		(490)	124.5%	
4610 Website Hosting & Email Acc	361	1,500	1,139		1,139	24.0%	
Communications :- Indirect Payments	<b>8,144</b>	<b>3,750</b>	<b>(4,394)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(4,394)</b>	<b>217.2%</b>	<b>5,263</b>
<b>Net Payments</b>	<b>(8,144)</b>	<b>(3,750)</b>	<b>4,394</b>				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	5,263						
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>(2,881)</b>						
<u>170 Contingency Fund</u>							
4790 New Initiatives Fund	9,576	15,000	5,424		5,424	63.8%	
Contingency Fund :- Indirect Payments	<b>9,576</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>5,424</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,424</b>	<b>63.8%</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Net Payments</b>	<b>(9,576)</b>	<b>(15,000)</b>	<b>(5,424)</b>				
<u>999 VAT Data</u>							
115 VAT on Receipts	5,564	0	(5,564)			0.0%	
VAT Data :- Receipts	<b>5,564</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(5,564)</b>				<b>0</b>
515 VAT on Payments	746	0	(746)		(746)	0.0%	
VAT Data :- Indirect Payments	<b>746</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(746)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(746)</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Net Receipts over Payments</b>	<b>4,819</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(4,819)</b>				
Grand Totals:- Receipts	122,931	116,187	(6,744)			105.8%	
Payments	106,114	116,187	10,073	0	10,073	91.3%	
<b>Net Receipts over Payments</b>	<b>16,817</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(16,817)</b>				
plus Transfer from EMR	7,068						
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>23,886</b>						

**Bank Reconciliation Statement as at 28/02/2023  
for Cashbook 2 - Unity Trust Saving A/c**

<u>Bank Statement Account Name (s)</u>	<u>Statement Date</u>	<u>Page No</u>	<u>Balances</u>
Unity Trust Savings A/c	28/02/2023		85,529.80
			0.00
			<hr/> 85,529.80
<u>Unpresented Cheques (Minus)</u>		<u>Amount</u>	
		0.00	
			<hr/> 0.00
			85,529.80
<u>Receipts not Banked/Cleared (Plus)</u>			
		0.00	
			<hr/> 0.00
			85,529.80
		<b>Balance per Cash Book is :-</b>	<b>85,529.80</b>
		<b>Difference is :-</b>	<b>0.00</b>

**Westbourne Parish Council, 9 March 2023**

**Agenda item 15: Payments for approval**

(DD: payment made by Direct Debit, IB: payment made by Internet Banking, C: cheque payment including number, PC: payment made by petty cash, \*movement of an earmarked reserve, \*\* paid from No 2 account)

<b>Payments for approval</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>Net</b>	<b>VAT</b>
DD	EE Mobile phone	18.00	15.00	3.00
BACS	Confidential payments Feb 23	1,584.61	1,584.61	0.00
BACS	WSCC LGPS Jan 23	509.70	509.70	0.00
	Microshade cloud storage and email			
BACS	accounts	128.57	107.14	21.43
BACS	MS 365	9.48	7.90	1.58
BACS				
		<b>2,250.36</b>	<b>2,224.35</b>	<b>26.01</b>

<b>Payments for retrospective approval</b>				
	Longmeadows playbark, signs, flower			
BACS	trough, structure in copse	2,389.00	2,311.67	77.33
BACS	PDC Print newsletter printing	313.00	313.00	0.00
BACS	Monster Creative sign printing	100.22	83.52	16.70
	GM Support playground inspections			
BACS	Jan/Feb 23	130.00	130.00	0.00
		<b>2,932.22</b>	<b>2,838.19</b>	<b>94.03</b>

## **Westbourne Parish Council, 9 March 2023**

### **Agenda item 16: Correspondence list**

- Planning appeal decision APP/L3815/W/21/3267477 Meadow View Stables, Monk's Hill, Westbourne. To note the decision of the Planning Inspectorate to allow the change of use of land for use as extension to Gypsy caravan site for the stationing of six additional caravans, including no more than three static caravans/mobile homes, together with laying of hardstanding and erection of three no. amenity buildings, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule.
- Anti-social behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. Public Space Protection Order – Dog Control. CDC is reviewing this policy <https://www.chichester.gov.uk/dogadviceandinformation>. Writing to ask the Council's view on any dog related issues to be included in new policy by 24 March.
- Email from Nicholas Bennett, Divisional Manager at CDC, about Purdah in the run up to the election which starts on 22 March 2023.
- Email from the Woodmancote Residents' Association to ask that the Parish Council takes on the ongoing maintenance of the defibrillator in Woodmancote.