From: [redacted]
To: David Bartlett
Cc: Brian Lucas; Jim Toogood
Subject: Destination Ventnor
Date: 04 May 2018 15:39:09
Attachments: [redacted]

Dear Sirs

Having read the Destination Ventnor leaflet we are writing both to protest at the deliberately and blatantly misleading description of the proposals that it contains and to register our objections to the proposed scheme.

Clearly the diagram was drawn by someone who had never visited Ventnor. The location of Church Street is wrong, Tulse Hill is indicated, but un-named, as the start of the zone, Pier Street south of Albert Road cannot be one way, Spring Hill is mis-named, etc.. The western end of Dudley Road is an 'S' bend that includes a significant width reduction and any commercial or public service vehicle that managed to traverse it would require the full width of Albert Street to make a left turn that can only be followed by another left turn down to the Esplanade from which there is no return. A right turn for such a vehicle is impossible given that Albert Street is at its narrowest immediately east of Pound Lane.

Pound Lane is at best an alley way with direct property access onto the carriageway and inadequate, or non-existent, footpaths in a number of areas. Again the width of the carriageways prohibits a left turn into Market Street for large vehicles. Necessarily restricting access to some streets for some vehicles, together with additional traffic signals would create a signage forest in the town which would be detrimental to it as a 'destination'.

Our main objection to the proposed scheme is that the car-free zone only includes 30 business premises that may, or in many cases will not, 'benefit' from being located within the zone. The remainder of the High Street, Pier Street, Albert Street, Victoria Street, Spring Hill and Dudley Road currently serve more than 65 business premises all of which will suffer from, the loss of on-street parking, additional traffic and significantly more restricted access than they currently enjoy.

The proposal creates a car-free zone for a minority of commercial premises at the expense of vastly increasing traffic flows along primarily residential roads, Pound Lane, Albert Street & Dudley Road.

The area considered by the proposed scheme if far too limited. If both Church Street, and the unmentioned Hambrough Road, are one way from the west into town the position for local residents to the west is totally unacceptable. Does the VTC really think that requiring traffic accessing adjacent local roads, Alpine Road, Park Avenue, Belgrave Road, Castle Road, etc., and major businesses and employers like the Royal Hotel, to take a route up Spring Hill, along Mitchell Avenue and Ocean View Road then down Zig Zag Road, is in anyway reasonable. Of course those heading slightly further west towards St. Lawrence could use Castle Road but this is already suffering increased traffic and use by buses and coaches due to the long term closure of Undercliff Drive, a situation that the VTC totally ignores.

We respectfully suggest that the VTC gives no further consideration to this unworkable, retrograde, disruptive and unpopular scheme and looks to gain the support of the community with positive changes that benefit both the whole Town and its occupants.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]