

BERRY HILL, CHRISTCHURCH & EDGE END NDP ANALYSIS OF EVENT 2				
1 Distinctive character and architecture comments				
2. Potential development comments				
3-8 Objectives check & comments on objectives				

Transport														
Objectives	Nos in agreement (ticks) 19/6/14	Nos in agreement (ticks) 20/6/14	TOTAL Agree	Agree % of respondents	Disagree	Disagree % of respondents	Amend	Amend %	No of respondents	Comments				
1. reduce where possible the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys	34	34	68	94%	1	1%	3	4%	72	Reduction of use of car is impossible if you are disabled and rely on a car (i.e. specialised conversion)	Have walking only days to increase community cohesion	Difficult to achieve in a rural setting	Community transport a good idea? On working model	
2. position development within easy walking distance of bus stops, the schools, a community health, wellbeing and fitness centre, a shop and other community facilities	32	32	64	97%	0	0%	2	3%	66	(comment taken off flip chart) I think new housing will attract commuters as they will already have a job to be able to afford mortgages. I prefer no. 3 as otherwise those new commuters may not be encouraged to use the towns and 'dormitories' will be encouraged.	Geographically difficult due to existing infrastructure			
3 .link all developments to the village/ community hub centre with footpaths, and cycle tracks where appropriate	37	36	73	99%	0	0%	1	1%	74	We do not have a community hub				
4. reduce road traffic congestion	28	31	59	97%	1	2%	1	2%	61	(comment taken off flip chart) I feel 'air quality' electric buses, etc. could be mentioned. The UK is being sued for missing targets	Only limited congestion	Attracting population increase conflicts with this aim		
5. position new development such that current problems e.g. congestion, parking and road safety are not created/exacerbated.	31	37	68	97%	1	1%	1	1%	70	(comment taken from flip chart) Free parking !!!!	These problems are already present. Increased population will make it worse			
6. optimise a walking and cycling network.	30	36	66	97%	0	0%	2	3%	68	Might be costly to upkeep Cost will be a major factor	Link new cycle routes into the excellent current ones that we have; provide new safe walkways suitable for the disabled and mobility scooters			
7. increase bus services via public /private operators and voluntary services	33	35	68	94%	0	0%	4	6%	72	only at primary (school)	Increase public transport but keep it affordable for all	Encourage any transport help - different sizes of buses mini vans etc.	include community and/or users + planning routes + timetable	
8 reduce the speed limit to 20mph within school zones	35	36	71	93%	1	1%	4	5%	76	Slow Horses sign on Joyford Lane	20 mph does more harm than good. The only ones to benefit is government with fines	20mph traffic in school zones at appropriate times i.e. not after 5pm	Not only keep 20 mph in school areas but also adhere to 30 mph limit on Woodland Road	Most 'school zone' areas have some sort of traffic calming located outside them. The road outside the main entrance to Lakers has a speed limit but isn't always adhered to
Not numbered										Christchurch Speed of through traffic Woodland Road 'Rat Run' No repeater 30mph signs. Council stance is that they are not necessary due to the 'system of street lighting' which are orange lights stuck on GPO wooden poles and not proper lamp posts Most drivers do not know that this system indicates 30 mph. Many do 50 mph! Identity signage at Hillersland/Ross Rd. should be placed 'CHRISTCHURCH WELCOMES CAREFUL DRIVERS' this should re-inform the village identity and the need to reduce speed. Your statement is incorrect - ref. Symonds Yat Road. There is no such road it is Woodland Road and the Post Office mover several years ago!! This is incorrectly assessed by VAL!!				

