From: website@ventnortc.org
To: townclerk@ventnortc.org
Subject: Website Message
Date: 29 April 2018 18:40:34

ID: 1000328
DATE: 19:40:33 2018-04-29
NAME: [redacted]
EMAIL: [redacted]
MESSAGE: I support the thinking behind the council's strategy for Ventnor and would like to see the pedestrianisation proposals worked up into a potential scheme. There is however more work to do on the practical implications.

A significant handicap for the High Street scheme is the lack of sunlight in the proposed pedestrianised section, owing to its alignment, width, and tall buildings. The whole scheme sinks or swims on the pedestrianised environment being attractive. Leaving aside the practical issues, Pier Street is much better aligned (as is of course the Esplanade).

As a proposal it should be developed as an integrated package of improvements to the Town Centre (or Esplanade), looking also at signage, lighting, trees, paving, parking, on-street trading, cultural events etc. Whilst increasing the cost, the scheme is unlikely to succeed or benefit the town if progressed as a traffic scheme alone.

On traffic flow, hard data on current vehicle movements would be helpful to better model any alternative. Westbound travel looks awkward in the current proposal; reviewing the one/two-way status of Victoria Road and Pier Street might be the only way to make it work, if also raising other potential issues.

There will clearly be traffic implications over a wider area. For example the current one-way of Hambrough Road makes sense given the current clockwise town centre flow, but might better be reversed under your proposed scheme, particularly if Pier Street south of Albert Road is made one-way as your map suggests? Further, displaced traffic will clearly seek other routes such as Mitchell Avenue, or even the Esplanade, and therefore knock on to the wider town; a practical route (for a large coach) for such journeys as Shanklin to Botanic Garden needs to be confirmed, and signposting across the town reviewed accordingly.

A comprehensive review of parking provision and tariffs is needed. The Central car park would be better as a short-term shoppers' car park, ideally with a short period of free parking, which would help in selling the scheme. Badging Central as a "long-term car park" makes no sense (even now). Indeed its tariff should discourage or even prevent long-term parking, which would be better displaced to other car parks with tariffs designed to accommodate long-stay visitors with less attractive options for shorter stays. Clearer signposting is then needed to direct people to short- and long-term parking when they arrive in town.

Good luck!