

## NEW FOOTWAYS PROJECT

## RESULTS OF CONSULTATION, SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2021

## FINAL REPORT

## Appendix: Full Listing of Consultation Form Responses

<b>Q.1A Do you support this project's objective of improving the safety of pedestrians to walk along the entire length of Medstead Road and Kings Hill?</b>	
<p>Total responses: - YES 95 (86%) NO 15 (14%)          Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 10 (77%) NO 3 (23%)          Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 28 (100%) NO 0 (0%)          Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 14 (100%) NO 0 (0%)          Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 6 (75%) NO 2 (25%)          Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 3 (100%) NO 0 (0%)          Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 4 (57%) NO 3 (43%)          Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 20 (74%) NO 7 (26%)          Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 9 (100%) NO 0 (0%)</p>	
<b>Q.1B If 'No', please explain why. How could the objective be changed to gain your support?</b>	
<u>Form#25</u> Yes - But I think it should extend to cyclists and horse riders and I think some of your proposals will concentrate traffic into a narrower carriageway causing more potential risks.	<u>Council Response</u> Formal design of the new footways to also be able to accommodate cyclists and horse riders would greatly increase the width of the footways, and hence the cost of constructing them. The use of the new footways by pedestrians will not be so intense as to prevent their informal use by horse riders and cyclists (particularly children), in much the same way as the footpath to the A339 is used by some horse riders and cyclists now. The on-road footways will give the perception of a narrowed carriageway, but we believe this will result in slower traffic and reduced risks. However, we will be guided by the road safety standards imposed by HCC.
<u>Form#31</u> Because the proposals for Kings Hill have not been finalised and are not at present supported by HCC. Need to see a final scheme. Also there does not appear to be any information relating to pedestrian demand on the various sections.	<u>Council Response</u> HCC <b>do</b> support the proposals for that part of Kings Hill up to no.39 on the south side, i.e. on the stretch where nearly all the houses are situated, and beyond which there will certainly be less pedestrian traffic (on which basis the project beyond no.39 has been deferred). Demand has not been quantified, but we know that demand exists from the 2016 neighbourhood plan questionnaire, and this is a project designed to enable walking travel (in particular) in line with current policy at all levels of government.
<u>Form#34</u> I do not accept the contents of the Beech Road Safety Working Group Report to Beech Parish Council which appears biased, prejudiced, subjective and promotes false and misleading conclusions. There does not appear to be any problem with the existing road layout that requires any intervention. I often walk along Kings Hill and Medstead Road. I feel as safe as I would reasonably expect to feel considering that these roads are semi-rural and village roads designed without footpaths which are unnecessary. I do not consider that any change to the road layout is either necessary or justified. The on-road raised footway in particular is not a sensible or logical proposal since there is insufficient width therefore it will constrict the road causing	<u>Council Response</u> The Working Group was set up in response to the widespread feeling in the village (as gleaned from responses both to the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire and to the questionnaire used in the 2002 Village Design Statement) that speeding and road safety are the pre-eminent problems in the village and they are of long standing. This is not an issue invented by the Working Group or the Parish Council. The Working Group's Report is intended to address the issue, in good faith, and so we reject the accusation of bias or prejudice. Your objections are noted and will be taken into consideration. On the subject of the proposed on-road footway, road width would be a key consideration for both us and HCC at the

<p>cars to swerve and necessarily mount the footway to pass oncoming traffic resulting in significant increased risk to both pedestrians and drivers. The proposals are misguided, ill-advised and if implemented, would not in any case result in a material reduction of risk to pedestrians but would most likely increase risk to pedestrians. The proposals if implemented would result in a wholly unnecessary, ill-advised and grotesque intervention which would change the whole character of the village to its detriment. The proposals would represent an unwarranted encroachment and disruption to the free flow of traffic and would encourage undesirable driver behaviour. I therefore strongly object to the proposals which would, if implemented, be a senseless waste of money resulting in unnecessary carbon emissions. The proposals should therefore be amended to leave the road layout as existing.</p>	<p>detailed design stage. It is the case, however, that the on-road footway is intended to deliberately narrow the perceived width of the carriageway, prompting slower and more careful driving, which is desirable.</p>
<p><u>Form#47</u> I'd have preferred a more balanced objective so "for all road users" but omitting "with particular emphasis on pedestrians".</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> At present it is pedestrians, in particular, who feel unsafe on Medstead Road and Kings Hill. There is no objective or desire to reduce the safety of other road users, including vehicle users. HCC will have oversight over the design and safety of any scheme that is pursued, and would ensure that the safety of all road users is preserved.</p>
<p><u>Form#48</u> This is a loaded question. Roads are for cars – pavements for pedestrians. I'd support measures to reduce car speeds on these two roads.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The proposed on-road footways are intended and expected to help reduce car speeds on those sections of road. The stretch of road next to the woods is, we believe, less likely to see speed reductions, and so it seems sensible to take pedestrians off the road where we can.</p>
<p><u>Form#54</u> Support the project but it requires different solutions for different sections of the village.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Understood.</p>
<p><u>Form#60</u> Obviously the only sane answer to this question is yes. A more pertinent question would be "do we support the objective of improving pedestrian safety in the manner being suggested "</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The questions that follow permit respondents to comment on the "manner being suggested" in each section of road.</p>
<p><u>Form#71</u> The priority should be reducing speeding traffic to improve pedestrian safety. The project does nothing to address this issue. Average speed cameras with automatic fines would apparently be far cheaper and address the primary issue. Why do HCC and the Police not want this solution?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Speeding enforcement is down to the police, whose operations we cannot control. But we do lobby them and they regularly commit resources to Beech speed traps. However, we cannot rely on police resources being available in perpetuity. This is why the focus of this project is on improving pedestrian safety through footways, which is something that we ourselves can initiate and drive forward. Speed reduction may be part of a solution, in parts of the village, that achieves more safety for pedestrians. Spending on speeding enforcement comes from police budgets. Funding for the footway project will not, so there is no read across between the two. Bluntly, to the police and HCC, the accident rate in Beech doesn't merit any more action on speed limits and enforcement than is currently in place. In that respect, Beech is no different to hundreds of other rural villages.</p>
<p><u>Form#74</u> 1. The fundamental issue is that the road is busy and becoming busier each year with traffic having little respect for speed limits and other road users. 2. A raised pavement at any part of Medstead Road and Kings Hill would cause single lane traffic which is neither</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Traffic volumes through Beech are outside our control, other than making representations in respect of nearby housing development plans etc. Speeding enforcement is down to the police, whose operations we cannot control. But we do lobby them and they regularly</p>

<p>practical or safe. This rural/semi-rural road is simply not wide enough for two way traffic and a raised pavement therefore making it more unsafe for both pedestrians , other vulnerable road users AND traffic – a worse situation than at present.</p> <p>3. The safety of all vulnerable road users is important. By attempting to potentially make the road safer for pedestrians there is a greater risk of making the road significantly less safe for others e.g. horse riders, carriage drivers and others who cannot use a raised kerb/pavement safely. This is why most rural/semi-rural roads and lanes do not have pavements and users keep themselves safe by wearing hi-viz and being aware that traffic will be around them at all times. I frequently walk from Kings Hill down to Medstead Road and up to Abbey Road and have not felt any more unsafe than on any other road. The current areas of white road markings are a sensible guide for both pedestrians and other road users and enable a safe shared use between all. Therefore I don't believe the objective can be changed to gain my support.</p>	<p>commit resources to Beech speed traps. However, we cannot rely on police resources being available in perpetuity. This is why the focus of this project is on improving pedestrian safety through footways, which is something that we ourselves can initiate and drive forward. Speed reduction may be part of a solution, in parts of the village, that achieves more safety for pedestrians.</p> <p>Bluntly, to the police and HCC, the accident rate in Beech doesn't merit any more action on speed limits and enforcement than is currently in place. In that respect, Beech is no different to hundreds of other rural villages.</p> <p>In the sections where an on-road footway is proposed, opposing vehicles will be able to pass each other in much the same way as they do now (since the overall width of the carriageway will not be reduced), but should do so more carefully and slowly in the presence of the on-road footway (and any pedestrians thereon). Our current preference is to have a low kerb (c.20mm), which vehicles can mount easily. We will take HCC advice on the optimum safe kerb configuration. But we do know that there are successful on-road footway precedents both with and without a low kerb. The stretches of 'twin white lines' shared space, which you allude to and support, are in effect rudimentary on-road footways. The proposed on-road footways are also shared space, being more well-defined and eye-catching versions of the twin white lines, where it is clearer that pedestrians should be expected and respected.</p>
<p><u>Form#83</u></p> <p>Yes. However we think traffic calming and better road visibility is the priority, which in turn would provide greater safety for pedestrians.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>Current HCC policy is not to install new physical traffic calming measures (such as humps or pinch points). There is little we can do about road sight lines in the village. But it is also the case that even if traffic kept to the speed limit, the need to walk in the road makes it hazardous for pedestrians along most of Medstead Road and Kings Hill, to the extent that many avoid doing so as much as they can. Hence this project.</p>
<p><u>Form#84</u></p> <p>No, not in its current form, we are concerned about the safety of all road users in Beech and do not consider the proposal is sufficiently inclusive.</p> <p>We consider that any scheme should be assessed on sustainability and environmental grounds, both in terms of impact during deployment and operation, for example it has been shown that schemes involving speed bumps while slowing down traffic, promote more acceleration/braking and adversely affect the environment in terms of air quality and noise pollution. The proposal does not appear to cover these aspects. The proposal does not consider the ongoing maintenance requirements, costs and responsibilities. Please also see responses to the other questions for specific aspects of the proposal that we consider need addressing.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>HCC will have oversight over the design and safety of any scheme that is pursued, and would ensure that the safety of all road users is preserved.</p> <p>No speed bumps or similar are proposed in this scheme; current HCC policy is not to employ new such infrastructure, partly for the reasons you mention.</p> <p>The scheme is currently at the conceptual stage. Ongoing maintenance requirements, costs and responsibilities will form part of the detailed development and design of the scheme, which will be the next stage if the parish council decides it should be pursued, following this consultation.</p>
<p><u>Form#92</u></p> <p>We support improving the safety of pedestrians, however this should be alongside speed reduction.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>We agree. Alongside the new footways project we are doing what is within our power on the subjects of reduced speed limits and speed limit enforcement.</p>
<p><u>Form#95</u></p> <p>We support the premise but the objective should also focus on the need to change driver behaviour.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>Noted. Alongside the new footways project we are doing what is within our power on the subjects of reduced speed limits and speed limit enforcement.</p>
<p><u>Form#100</u></p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p>

<p>Yes AND No. Concerned that the road would become more dangerous if narrower for vehicles, cyclists and equestrian use; funding of total project and the continued maintenance.</p>	<p>Even where an on-road footway is proposed, the carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other (and other road users) much as now, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians. It is envisaged that the project will be implemented in stages, as and when funding is sourced and becomes available, which is likely to be over several years.</p> <p>The methods, costs and responsibility for maintenance will be determined during the detailed design stage in consultation with HCC.</p>
<p><u>Form#103</u> When we purchased our property over 20 years ago we do so with the knowledge that we would not be walking down the road as it is not wide enough to accommodate cars and pedestrians. We feel trying to encourage people to use the road to walk is dangerous and the cost of implementing and maintaining these paths too high.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. However, many residents <b>do</b> wish to walk in the village, nor unreasonably, and the purpose of the project is to facilitate them doing so in a safer manner than they can now.</p>
<p><u>Form#105</u> This has been needed for many years.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Agreed.</p>
<p><u>Form#107</u> Before commenting I have one question – WHY!!! This is a small rural village. At present the only scourge on it is the speeding motorist. Before we give in completely to these selfish motorists think about the whole rural idyll we live in. The majority of pedestrians at present are those walking their dogs who want to access the woods as soon as possible – fairly easy for the majority of residents. People might want to access the village hall of an evening – are all pathways going to include extra lighting. On road pavements in the narrow parts, these will only force traffic towards the middle of the road leading to very unsafe conditions for both pedestrians and vehicles. At present traffic does not generally slow when any obstruction is encountered, it merely pulls to the side of the road i.e. where the footpath might be. Residents of Beech might understand the new road format but will others!! Before any scheme is likely to work, vehicle speed must be slowed first. Nothing in this scheme addresses this problem and in fact is likely to speed up traffic in certain areas.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The Working Group was set up in response to the widespread feeling in the village (as gleaned from responses both to the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire and to the questionnaire used in the 2002 Village Design Statement) that speeding and road safety are the pre-eminent problems in the village and they are of long standing. This is not an issue invented by the Working Group or the Parish Council. There is no question of giving in to speeding. We are separately pursuing a lower speed limit and more effective means of enforcement. Speeding enforcement is down to the police, whose operations we cannot control. But we do lobby them and they regularly commit resources to Beech speed traps. However, we cannot rely on police resources being available in perpetuity. This is why the focus of this project is on improving pedestrian safety through footways, which is something that we ourselves can initiate and drive forward. Speed reduction may be part of a solution, in parts of the village, that achieves more safety for pedestrians. Also, even if all traffic adheres to the speed limit, it is still potentially hazardous to pedestrians walking along the road (e.g. failing to give enough clearance to pedestrians, especially when opposing vehicles are passing). So the project is valid independent of speed reduction initiatives.</p> <p>Regarding lighting, the on-road footways and new roadside off-road footways will benefit from the current street lighting. Where there are on-road footways, the carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other as now, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians.</p> <p>Where new off-road footways are proposed, in the less built-up stretches alongside Bushy Leaze Wood, pedestrians are fairly infrequent at present, so vehicles are already not usually impeded by pedestrians. So we believe that there will be no significant change to vehicle speeds on this stretch if pedestrians are taken off-road altogether.</p>
<p><u>Form#108</u> We would not be in favour of a raised footway in the Medstead Road section as it would cause problems with the</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We provisionally proposed a footway with a very low kerb (20) that would be easy for a vehicle to mount if necessary. Where</p>

<p>flow of 2 way traffic. Visibility would also be poor. Also, due to the amount of trees and flooding that we have, I don't think the upkeep and visibility of the path would be maintained.</p>	<p>an on-road footway is proposed, the carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other (and other road users) much as now, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians. And, as part of the existing carriageway, visibility would be as good as visibility of the existing roadside, with debris tending to be washed away by surface water.</p>
---	---

**Q.2A Do you support the provision of a new on-road footway in the village centre (27-91 Medstead Road) on the south side of the road?**

<p>Total responses: - YES 93 (85%) NO 17 (15%)          Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 9 (69%) NO 4 (31%)          Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 28 (100%) NO 0 (0%)          Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 15 (100%) NO 0 (0%)          Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 5 (63%) NO 3 (38%)          Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 2 (67%) NO 1 (33%)          Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 5 (71%) NO 2 (29%)          Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 21 (78%) NO 6 (22%)          Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 8 (89%) NO 1 (11%)</p>
--

**Q.2B If 'No', please state why. How could the proposals be changed to gain your support?**

<p><u>Form#7</u>          This road is narrow with two blind bends. Large vehicles already have to take avoiding action and there have been a number of minor collisions especially at the bend near number 61. To have vehicles approaching a blind bend with a further restriction on width is potentially dangerous both for the vehicle occupants and pedestrians.          I have no objection to the proposal where the road is straight or the driver (and pedestrians) can see around a corner. The one in Dorset does not appear to have high hedges and blind bends.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>          The expectation is that the on-road footway, together with appropriate new traffic signage, will itself cause vehicles to drive more slowly and cautiously in this section than they do now. The carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians.          In general, the on-road footway is intended to be on the outside of bends, thus maximising the visibility of pedestrians. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage. There is no reason why the cutting back of some high hedges cannot be part of the overall safety detailed design. The Dorset example does include bends with limited visibility.</p>
<p><u>Form#25</u>          I think some of your proposals will concentrate traffic into a narrower carriageway causing more potential risks unless there is formal traffic calming at regular intervals. Simply squeezing the traffic is not going to give pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders much security. It needs to be allied to regular traffic calming measures with priorities identified</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>          We believe the perception of a narrower carriageway will cause traffic to drive more carefully and slowly than it does now. In this respect the on-road footway performs as a continuous traffic calming measure, as well as providing a well-defined space where non-vehicular users clearly have priority. Current HCC policy is not to install other physical traffic calming measures of the type you describe but introducing features that give the appearance of a narrower road is an approach that is commended by HCC in their recent technical guide note on traffic calming</p>
<p><u>Form#31</u>          I'm nervous about making the effective carriageway even narrower over this section where it already can be tedious passing another vehicle. But I accept that this is really the only option for this section.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>          We believe that the perception of a narrowed carriageway will assist with slowing down traffic.</p>
<p><u>Form#34</u>          Same comment as for Q1B.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>          As for Q1B.</p>
<p><u>Form#38</u>          Yes - Provided the plan is fully approved by Hampshire Highways safety team. The materials used are tested as to be fit for purpose i.e. to withstand erosion by water and rubble. The</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>          We aim to satisfy all of those conditions.</p>

construction of the path does not alter the current driveway entrances or the current materials thereon.	
<u>Form#40</u> [Yes but] the road is rather narrow at this point and on a bend so could be dangerous if not carefully designed.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage.
<u>Form#45</u> Fully support the provision of a footway but as a regular club cyclist cannot support as proposed. The proposal states that the expectation is for cyclists to use the footway but a kerb, even as low 20-40mm, presents a real danger to cyclists if for example you need to mount/dismount the footway in a hurry to avoid pedestrians or traffic when cycling parallel to it. Catching a wheel on a lip/kerb of the proposed height can easily cause an accident and in dark or wet conditions it's even more easily done – I can personally attest to this and have seen a friend badly injured (broken femur) catching a wheel. To get my full support it would need a solution like the Rowledge one, painted lines, obvious different colour surface for the footway etc. to allow cyclists to easily swap between the road and footway as conditions require.	<u>Council Response</u> Thank you for this response. The Working Group will carefully examine your concerns about the safety of cyclists. We are confident that, through careful design, a safe separation between the road surface and on-road footway can be achieved.
<u>Form#47</u> That part of Medstead Road is narrow (and dark) enough as it is. I don't support making it even narrower. It is, after all, a fairly important through road towards Medstead and Four Marks. Adding any form of on-road pathway will in effect turn it into a single track road, which is not appropriate.	<u>Council Response</u> Vehicles already have to take care when passing each other on this stretch of road, and the on-road footway is intended to accentuate that effect, thus slowing down traffic to the benefit of all and to pedestrians in particular. If that acts as a disincentive for the road to be used as a shortcut, by traffic heading north from Four Marks that should be using the A31/A339 major roads, then so much the better.
<u>Form#48</u> The road is narrow enough at present without making it even more narrow. I'd support off-road footways which would be much safer.	<u>Council Response</u> Unfortunately for the vast majority of this stretch there appears to be virtually no land available on either side of the carriageway for the construction of an off-road footpath. And purchasing strips of land from all of the properties fronting the road is impractical. The on-road footway is intended to make the road look and feel narrower (and this promote more careful and slower driving), without actually reducing the width of carriageway.
<u>Form#54</u> The potential of causing a serious accident because of the raised curve [kerb?] is too great.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety (including on the subject of the kerb) at the detailed design stage.
<u>Form#60</u> We feel that any footpath solution that involves an area of coloured tarmac on an existing roadway will give a false sense of security to pedestrians and lower awareness of traffic.	<u>Council Response</u> Reports from places where a similar scheme has been implemented do not support this view.
<u>Form#69</u> [Yes but] Can we avoid signs all over the place? Can we buy back land at the bottleneck turning left at the end of Wellhouse? Previously controversial.	<u>Council Response</u> Ultimately the road signage associated with the scheme will be dictated by HCC, but we too would lobby to keep clutter to a minimum. The precise form of the footway scheme around the Wellhouse Rd/Medstead Rd junction will be determined with HCC at the detailed design stage. Acquiring land from residents will be avoided if at all possible.
<u>Form#73</u> I am concerned that without a kerb it could be dangerous.	<u>Council Response</u> Our current preference is to have a low kerb (c.20mm). We will take HCC advice on the optimum safe kerb configuration.
<u>Form#74</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

<p>The only on-road footway in the village centre that I would support is by white-lining only. No raised kerb or pavement.</p>	<p>Our current preference is to have a low kerb (c.20mm). We will take HCC advice on the optimum safe kerb configuration. We think it is important for the on-road footway to have a different coloured surface, to make it well-defined and eye-catching, denoting where pedestrians should be expected and respected.</p>
<p><u>Form#83</u> Theoretically yes but concerned it'll make a narrow road narrower and actually more dangerous.</p> <p><u>Form#84</u> From a vehicle user's perspective this section is narrow and has significant 2 stretches where blind bends are an issue, exacerbated by high hedges very close to the road. We are concerned that this will force vehicle users to drive on the footway as they cannot see far enough ahead to safely move out into the middle of the road (especially as being further out in the road would further reduce visibility). This would effectively nullify the objective of increasing pedestrian safety and increase risks for drivers/cyclists.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. The carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#85</u> [Yes but] Not too urban in design please and take account of run-off water so it does not divert and cause damage.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. Drainage aspects will be part of the detailed design process.</p>
<p><u>Form#91</u> Yes (Although I am sceptical about the suggested cost of provision... and maintenance).</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. Responsibility, methods and cost of maintenance will be factors addressed at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#92</u> May support an on-road footway if it was like the example within Rowledge rather than South Perrott. If a system was installed as per the South Perrott example, as a driver, it would appear as only one vehicle could use a certain section at a time. This would lead to traffic "backing up" waiting to come through the area with an increase in noise and pollution. A small kerb may present a slip / trip risk to a pedestrian as there may be occasions an individual has to step out of the way of another. A small kerb increases the risk of a stumble and potential to fall into traffic and would present a greater risk to a cyclist who may clip their wheel. The examples shown in South Perrott appear to be wider roads with better visibility than in Beech. Anything mounting a kerb, even a small one, (which would occur) would increase the risk of an accident. Have the on-road footway, however without the raised kerb. In the narrow areas in the village, has the option to provide priority access from one way, same as in Four Marks under the railway bridge, been considered?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The provisional selection of the kerbed on-road footway was based upon (i) its perceived superior distinctiveness in demarcating the 'shared space' of the on-road footway from the rest of the carriageway, and (ii) the its successful operation (for over 9 years) on an A-road in South Perrott, Dorset to the satisfaction of the residents. The Working Group will carefully examine your concerns about the safety of cyclists and others with respect to the kerb. At the detailed design stage we will take the advice of HCC (who ultimately have the responsibility for the highway and its safety) on the optimum safe configuration of a kerb and all of these other matters. The priority one-way access arrangements that you describe depend on having clear visibility of the oncoming traffic on the far side of the 'narrow area', which is not achievable on the winding road in the village centre.</p>
<p><u>Form#100</u> Yes AND No. The road is dangerous, but making it narrower could possibly make it more of a hazard.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage. If it cannot be done safely, it won't be built.</p>
<p><u>Form#103</u> Medstead Road is already in places very narrow and to further narrow it would increase accidents in the village to vehicles and pedestrians.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#106</u> On road pavements in the narrow parts, these will only force traffic towards the middle of the road leading to very unsafe</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Where there are on-road footways, the carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that</p>

<p>conditions for both pedestrians and vehicles. At present traffic does not generally slow when any obstruction is encountered, it merely pulls to the side of the road i.e. where the footpath might be. The rule of the road is to face oncoming traffic. This scheme encourages the opposite when walking in one direction.</p>	<p>vehicles will still be able to pass each other as now, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians. In general, the on-road footway is intended to be on the outside of bends, thus maximising the visibility of pedestrians (which is a widely accepted exception to the rule you quote). The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#108</u> We would not be in favour of a raised footway in the Medstead Road section as it would cause problems with the flow of 2 way traffic. Visibility would also be poor. Also, due to the amount of trees and flooding that we have, I don't think the upkeep and visibility of the path would be maintained. We don't think the path system can work due to the road width that cannot be changed. Possibly coloured tarmac to "nudge" drivers to keep across slightly but as you say with the number of cars using the road the path will be ignored most of the time and the expense couldn't be justified.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We provisionally proposed a footway with a very low kerb (20) that would be easy for a vehicle to mount if necessary. Where an on-road footway is proposed, the carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other (and other road users) much as now, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians. And, as part of the existing carriageway, visibility would be as good as visibility of the existing roadside, with debris tending to be washed away by surface water. We would not expect the footway to be ignored - the expectation is that the on-road footway, together with appropriate new traffic signage, will itself cause vehicles to drive more slowly and cautiously in this section than they do now.</p>
<p><b>Q.3 Do you have other comments on the proposed new on-road footway in the village centre?</b></p>	
<p><u>Form#4</u> For safety reasons perhaps it may be desirable to take the footway off-road on the inside of the bend opposite the Wellhouse Road junction, or even put the footway on the north side of the road at that location.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage. Using some of the current verges may form part of the solution here, if absolutely unavoidable.</p>
<p><u>Form#7</u> The main problem is excessive speed and I see no proposal in the plan to tackle this apart from trying to get a 20mph limit.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The expectation is that the on-road footway, together with appropriate new traffic signage, will itself cause vehicles to drive more slowly and cautiously in this section than they do now. This would aid compliance with a 20mph limit.</p>
<p><u>Form#9</u> Initially this type of "painted on coloured ashpalt" on-road demarcation is clear but fairly quickly with time, wear and tear and grime they tend to become much less defined and this causes concern.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Agreed. Our preference is to use coloured material for the top 40mm of the footway, i.e. where the, normally black, matrix material of the asphalt is a different colour. This should be longer-lasting than a painted on option (and HCC too is not in favour of painted road surfaces).</p>
<p><u>Form#10</u> The surface of the footway should be such that it will be uncomfortable to drive on – not impossible to allow car to pass lorry etc – but only at very slow speed. If you go to rural villages in Holland they have this type of thing well sorted out. France too ...</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> This can be considered (examples welcome). But the surface will need to be conducive to walking by pedestrians of all ages and for use by cyclists, and will need to be approved by HCC.</p>
<p><u>Form#11</u> Having moved to Beech from Rowledge which is an example used here, we have first hand experience of it working.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#12</u> I frequently use the road as a pedestrian, to go up to the woods, down to the village Hall, to walk to or from Alton town centre, or to visit neighbours. I always feel vulnerable to passing fast traffic, and I have had several close shaves. The issues are fast cars in both directions, poor visibility due to bends, and, in several places, nowhere to escape due to high banks. I think the proposed on-road footway is an excellent and pragmatic solution which will make the road appear like a single-track</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>



road, forcing drivers to slow down and look for and avoid pedestrians.	
<u>Form#13</u> This is a great idea and the optimum solution for safe sharing of the carriageway by both pedestrians and motor vehicles in this residential area.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#14</u> Brilliant solution. Happy to offer some of our verge if it helps also.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#16</u> The height of the on-road kerbs is important – high enough to deter drivers from mounting them, but not too high for drivers to take evasive action should it be necessary.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#19</u> This appears to be the only practicable solution in the area of the village that is most dangerous for pedestrians and where the road width and banked sides exacerbate the hazardous conditions.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#21</u> Anything that slows traffic and creates a safer space for walkers would be an improvement.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#23</u> This proposal is eminently sensible and there are no other viable options that would be acceptable to the village.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#26</u> Make the kerb as high as possible so drivers really have to carefully bump up it or risk damaging an alloy wheel, especially relevant to the idiots who drive at very high speed!	<u>Council Response</u> We will take HCC advice on the optimum kerb configuration.
<u>Form#27</u> The curb should be as high as possible to protect pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> We will take HCC advice on the optimum kerb configuration. It will, however, be necessary for a vehicle to be able to mount the kerb in order to pass oncoming traffic, where necessary.
<u>Form#35</u> Width of footway needs to be sufficient to reduce risk of pedestrians being hit by wing mirrors etc. Narrower strips would give drivers the ‘apparent right’ to maintain speed even if pedestrians present. Path on one side means that in one direction pedestrians have their backs to near traffic. Pale buff surface would be a good colour for the pathway. Stripes/bright orange/reds would detract from the general ambience of the village.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed on all counts. We believe it is important to keep the footway on one side of the road, and the south side is generally on the outside of the bend (which many people think overrules the general ‘walk facing the traffic’ convention). Where the footway would be on the inside of a bend (opposite Wellhouse Road) there may need to be a modified solution, on which we will take HCC’s advice.
<u>Form#39</u> As I walk that way quite regularly delivering the Beech News I would support anything that makes walking on the road safer.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#40</u> CPO some additional land to widen the road!	<u>Council Response</u> From our discussions with HCC this is not an option that HCC would wish to pursue.
<u>Form#41</u> As a frequent walker, I am keen that this excellent initiative is accomplished as soon as it can be.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#44</u> I think the whole project has been well-considered and well-researched.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#47</u> Whilst I frequently walk within Beech and hence personally I would benefit from such a path, the vast majority of road-users on Medstead Road are motorists and the needs of the majority should prevail.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, but we would contend that motorists’ preferences should not totally eliminate the needs of residents who wish to walk in their own village. A better balance needs to be struck.
<u>Form#49</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

The new footpath should have a low kerb as the Dorset example shown.	We will take HCC's advice on the optimum kerb configuration.
<u>Form#50</u> A raised kerb will be very dangerous for cyclists as it is likely to catch the front wheel as they move off the road.	<u>Council Response</u> Thank you for this response. The Working Group will carefully examine your concerns about the safety of cyclists. We are confident that, through careful design, a safe separation between the road surface and on-road footway can be achieved.
<u>Form#51</u> Anything that enables a pedestrian such as myself to walk safely is essential.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#53</u> On-road footways are not ideal but they would be a great improvement over "nothing at all". I would feel much safer using it than walking on the road as we have to now.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#54</u> The way forward is to get residents to give up some land to build a proper footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> We don't believe that all of the necessary land in the village centre could be acquired in this way, and such a scheme would fail if there is one property owner that does not wish to co-operate. Also the cost of land acquisition, plus the cost to carve out a pathway from the frequent high banks and roadside features, makes this a very (probably prohibitively) expensive approach. Hence the preference to aim for an on-road footway approved as safe by HCC.
<u>Form#56</u> Very good idea – desperately needed!	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#62</u> A footway is becoming more important than ever, not only because of the amount of traffic along the road but also because of the nature of modern cars and modern engines which are quieter and therefore more of a danger to pedestrians. Electric vehicles in particular are very hard to hear for many people. On a personal note, the fact that we have to drive our 14 year old daughter to the horses that are only situated at the end of the village on the A339 – at most a 10 minute walk - is a sad testament to the state of the current safety of Medstead Road. The same applies in terms of reaching the entrance to Bushy Leaze Woods to walk the dog – we either take the long detour through the rec and up Wellhouse Road, or drive to the entrance which is ridiculous!	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#63</u> Entirely appropriate, particularly if coupled with a 20mph speed limit. This should be the approach throughout the entire length of the village.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, although the current proposal is not to extend it through the entire village.
<u>Form#64</u> Will there be signs to advise drivers that pedestrians have priority on the on-road footway?	<u>Council Response</u> Appropriate signage will be necessary, which will be agreed with HCC as the responsible authority.
<u>Form#65</u> I don't think it will work but it's definitely better than not doing anything. I regularly walk on Medstead Road, at least once a week, sometimes more. I believe that making the road seem narrower will just result in many people driving in the middle of the road instead of slowing down– maybe better for pedestrians but less so for other drivers. This is exactly what happens at the moment especially in the narrowest point as you come up from Alton just before Wellhouse.	<u>Council Response</u> Driver behaviour along the lines of that seen in the stretch you mention (i.e. slower and more careful when other traffic is encountered) is the sort of change that we wish to encourage.
<u>Form#69</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

<p>The proposal hugely benefits people at the lower end of Medstead Road. It is inconvenient to road users further up Medstead Road, from Medstead or Wellhouse Road. It forms a bottleneck in the highway turning left from Wellhouse Road. Effectively blocking/delaying all journeys for all residents in Wellhouse. Do we need priority to exit the village centre? Where does the entering traffic queue?</p>	<p>Opposing vehicles will be able to pass each other in much the same way as they do now (since the overall width of the carriageway will not be reduced), but should do so more carefully and slowly in the presence of the on-road footway (and any pedestrians thereon). The precise form of the footway scheme around the Wellhouse Rd/Medstead Rd junction will be determined with HCC at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#70</u> Whilst I full support the proposals for the improvement of footways, I firmly believe that this MUST be done in conjunction with enforcement of the current, legally enforceable speed limit. It is deplorable that police and local authority alike can 'make the choice' to ignore the daily flaunting of the law that takes place within the village on the roads generally. The proposed footway will be unsafe if traffic progresses at more than the current speed limit.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Enforcement is down to the police, whose operations we cannot control. But we do lobby them and they regularly commit resources to Beech speed traps. However, we cannot rely on police resources being available in perpetuity. This is why the focus of this project is on improving pedestrian safety through footways, which is something that we ourselves can initiate and drive forward. The expectation is that the on-road footway, probably together with appropriate new traffic signage, will itself cause vehicles to drive more slowly and cautiously in this section than they do now.</p>
<p><u>Form#72</u> Long overdue! Get the project done quickly!</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#74</u> Only to stress that I do not believe it to be a safe or sensible solution.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted.</p>
<p><u>Form#76</u> I support the overall plan but would ask that we evaluate a 'proper' footpath around the Medstead Road – Wellhouse Road junction by purchasing the required property frontages to support this.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. The precise form of the footway scheme around the Wellhouse Rd/Medstead Rd junction will be determined with HCC at the detailed design stage. Using some of the current verges may form part of the solution here, if absolutely unavoidable..</p>
<p><u>Form#77</u> This is good start to improve safety for pedestrians.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#81</u> The on-road footway is the only realistic option for a footway along this section of the road.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted.</p>
<p><u>Form#83</u> In the South Perrot and Rowledge road schemes pictures neither side of the road is narrowed by encroaching hedges and there appears relatively good distance visibility. Neither of which can be said for the centre of the village. Are Beech residents going to be asked to cut back their hedges where they encroach the road to improve visibility? They already push traffic towards the centre of the road. We're concerned that adding an on-road footpath at that point will make a narrow road with blind bends even more dangerous.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Any need for HCC to more strictly enforce the cutting back of hedges will come out of their further safety audits during the detailed design phase. It is certainly something that the Working Group can take up with HCC.</p>
<p><u>Form#84</u> To mitigate [our concern], can the committee explore the viability of introducing traffic light control to ensure that traffic is only moving in one direction at a time. Please can the committee publish the assessment it did which resulted in the selection of the 'South Perrott scheme, with the low-height kerb'. The benefits of this scheme are not clear to us. In particular we are concerned about the introduction of a mid-carriage kerb for several reasons: - does this represent a trip hazard for runners/walkers, especially during times of poorer visibility for example rain, low sun, early evening and obviously night time? - does this represent a hazard for cyclists? - given that road vehicles will inevitably need to cross this kerb on a</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The provisional selection of the kerbed on-road footway was based upon (i) its perceived superior distinctiveness in demarcating the 'shared space' of the on-road footway from the rest of the carriageway, and (ii) its successful operation (for over 9 years) on an A-road in South Perrott, Dorset, to the satisfaction of the residents. The Working Group will carefully examine your concerns about the safety of cyclists and others with respect to the kerb, and the implications of debris and surface drainage. We are confident that, through careful design, a safe separation between the road surface and on-road footway can be achieved. At the detailed design stage we will take</p>

<p>regular basis, how resilient will the kerb be and, in particular, how resilient will the road along either edge be given the numerous examples of eroded road surface throughout Beech? - would these issues be further exacerbated by obscuring caused by fallen leaves and/or obstruction caused by the stones and other debris that inevitably follow heavy rain? In addition, how would the on-road footways impact the already poor drainage on Beech's roads?</p>	<p>the advice of HCC (who ultimately have the responsibility for the highway and its safety) on the configuration of a kerb and all of these other matters. Given the length of this section of road in the village centre (several hundred metres) we don't believe that one-way traffic light control is practical – especially since residents exiting their drives would not be aware of the current direction of flow. It would also over-urbanise the village.</p>
<p><u>Form#86</u> To be wide enough to walk with a dog, not so narrow it's pointless and difficult to keep to a very narrow single line.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The proposal should accommodate your preference.</p>
<p><u>Form#87</u> Speeding traffic a major concern particularly for school age children waiting at bus stops/walking home.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Agreed.</p>
<p><u>Form#88</u> We like the proposed idea of having the footpaths but do wonder how this will affect drivers going through the narrower road with blind corners. Will there be some signage put up to alert the drivers?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The expectation is that the on-road footway, together with appropriate new traffic signage, will itself cause vehicles to drive more slowly and cautiously in this section than they do now.</p>
<p><u>Form#92</u> The area by Wellhouse Road is already a bottleneck – the concern is that by installing an on-road footway, this will make the area more dangerous.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. The precise form of the footway scheme around the Wellhouse Rd/Medstead Rd junction will be determined with HCC at the detailed design stage. Using some of the current verges may form part of the solution here, if absolutely unavoidable..</p>
<p><u>Form#95</u> How wide will the footpath be? Will it reduce the road to single file only for motorists, and, if so, which direction of travel would have priority? How will priorities be communicated to motorists? Has consideration been given to appropriate necessary signage? Are pedestrians going to be safe if the low kerb is mountable and vehicles continue to squeeze past in this severely constricted area? Should Hants CC refuse an on road path in sections B and C, where would this leave the project as a whole? Would you still pursue the suggested paths in other sections?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The on-road footway (1 – 1.5m variable width) is still part of the carriageway. It is a more formalised and deterring version of the 'twin white lines' already on some sections of the road. Opposing vehicles will be able to pass each other in much the same way as they do now (since the overall width of the carriageway will not be reduced), but should do so more carefully and slowly in the presence of a well-defined on-road footway (and any pedestrians thereon). Appropriate signage will be necessary, which will be agreed with HCC as the responsible authority. If, ultimately, a successful design cannot be agreed with HCC for the on-road footways, then we may still seek agreement with them on the proposed off-road footways, as these can be considered safety improvements in their own right.</p>
<p><u>Form#96</u> The current lack of such a facility is a critical safety issue .</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted.</p>
<p><u>Form#100</u> Any scheme must be 100% certain that it will not create more problems than it is trying to resolve.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Agreed.</p>
<p><u>Form#104</u> A raised kerb would be very dangerous for cyclists as they could catch their front wheel on the kerb causing them to fall off.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Thank you for this response. The Working Group will carefully examine your concerns about the safety of cyclists. We are confident that, through careful design, a safe separation between the road surface and on-road footway can be achieved.</p>
<p><u>Form#105</u> Where forward visibility doesn't extend from one end to the other of a narrowed single lane section it wouldn't be possible for drivers to see if they had a clear passage over this length. Thus at detail design stage, consideration must be given to accommodate passing vehicles within the narrowed single lane section. A possible solution might include signed and marked</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Opposing vehicles will be able to pass each other in much the same way as they do now (since the overall width of the carriageway will not be reduced), but should do so more carefully and slowly in the presence of the on-road footway (and any pedestrians thereon). So the road is not really single lane. Passing bays can be considered, but in</p>

dedicated vehicle passing bays. In that way vehicle drivers and pedestrians won't find themselves at conflict when this occurs.	reality vehicles need to be able to pass each other at any point along this section.
<u>Form#109</u> Will this effect the grass bank outside [redacted for privacy]?	<u>Council Response</u> We will not know until we start the detailed design of the footway around the Medstead Rd/Wellhouse Rd junction. If it does, we will of course liaise with the affected residents.
<u>Form#110</u> Very close to hitting an oncoming van who was not paying attention to position in road – had to drive into bank next to the road which wrecked offside front tyre/needed emergency tyre replacement. If pedestrian had also walked along roadside, I hate to think of outcome – either a head-on collision or possible fatality.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.

**Q.4A Do you support the provision of a new on-road footway on the south side of Kings Hill (1-39 Kings Hill)?**

Total responses: - YES 93 (85%) NO 17 (15%)  
 Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 9 (69%) NO 4 (31%)  
 Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 28 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
 Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 15 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
 Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 5 (63%) NO 3 (38%)  
 Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 2 (67%) NO 1 (33%)  
 Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 5 (71%) NO 2 (29%)  
 Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 21 (78%) NO 6 (22%)  
 Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 8 (89%) NO 1 (11%)

**Q.4B If 'No', please state why. How could the proposals be changed to gain your support?**

<u>Form#7</u> It needs to start after about number 5 to avoid the blind bend. If it did, I support it.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety, around the blind bend, at the detailed design stage.
<u>Form#25</u> I think some of your proposals will concentrate traffic into a narrower carriageway causing more potential risks unless there is formal traffic calming at regular intervals. Simply squeezing the traffic is not going to give pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders much security. It needs to be allied to regular traffic calming measures with priorities identified	<u>Council Response</u> We believe the perception of a narrower carriageway will cause traffic to drive more carefully and slowly than it does now. In this respect the on-road footway performs as a continuous traffic calming measure, as well as providing a well-defined space where non-vehicular users clearly have priority. Current HCC policy is not to install other new physical traffic calming measures of the type you describe.
<u>Form#31</u> I'm not aware why HCC did not support the proposals over this section of highway where downhill speeds are far too high. Can't comment further until firmer proposals are available but some form of physical speed restraints are necessary in my view, despite HCC's policy! I agree that humps would not be appropriate but chicanes might be. At present, the only way of keeping anywhere near the speed limit going downhill is to brake, but few drivers do and then cut the bend!	<u>Council Response</u> HCC do support the proposals for that part of Kings Hill up to no.39 on the south side, i.e. on the stretch where nearly all the houses are situated, and beyond which there will certainly be less pedestrian traffic (on which basis the project beyond no.39 was deferred). On the section up to no.39 we can discuss with HCC whether a chicane might be incorporated into the on-road footway construction.
<u>Form#34</u> Same comment as for Q1B.	<u>Council Response</u> As for Q1B.
<u>Form#38</u> Yes - Provided the plan is fully approved by Hampshire Highways safety team. The materials used are tested as to be fit for purpose i.e. to withstand erosion by water and rubble. The construction of the path does not alter the current driveway entrances or the current materials thereon.	<u>Council Response</u> We aim to satisfy all of those conditions.
<u>Form#45</u> Fully support the provision of a footway but as a regular club cyclist cannot support as proposed. The proposal states that the expectation is for cyclists to use the footway but a kerb, even as	<u>Council Response</u> Thank you for this response. The Working Group will carefully examine your concerns about the safety of cyclists.

<p>low 20-40mm, presents a real danger to cyclists if for example you need to mount/dismount the footway in a hurry to avoid pedestrians or traffic when cycling parallel to it. Catching a wheel on a lip/kerb of the proposed height can easily cause an accident and in dark or wet conditions it's even more easily done – I can personally attest to this and have seen a friend badly injured (broken femur) catching a wheel. To get my full support it would need a solution like the Rowledge one, painted lines, obvious different colour surface for the footway etc. to allow cyclists to easily swap between the road and footway as conditions require.</p>	
<p><u>Form#47</u> That part of [Kings Hill] is narrow (and dark) enough as it is. I don't support making it even narrower. It is, after all, a fairly important through road towards Medstead and Four Marks. Adding any form of on-road pathway will in effect turn it into a single track road, which is not appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Vehicles already have to take care when passing each other on this stretch of road, and the on-road footway is intended to accentuate that effect, thus slowing down traffic to the benefit of all and to pedestrians in particular. If that acts as a disincentive for the road to be used as a shortcut, by traffic heading north from Four Marks that should be using the A31/A339 major roads, then so much the better</p>
<p><u>Form#48</u> The road is narrow enough at present without making it even more narrow. I'd support off-road footways which would be much safer.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The on-road footway is intended to make the road look and feel narrower (and this promote more careful and slower driving), without actually reducing the width of carriageway.</p>
<p><u>Form#54</u> The potential of causing a serious accident because of the raised curve [kerb?] is too great.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety (including on the subject of the kerb) at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#60</u> This is the most dangerous section of the proposed footpath. A car travelling at 30 mph takes 2 seconds to get from the blind bend to the start of the proposed footpath. At that point a 1.5 metre width of coloured tarmac will do little to protect potential groups of pedestrians possibly with their backs to the traffic. The off road footpath across 1 Kings Hill should remain on Highways land across 3 Kings Hill until on the straight part of the road.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety, around the blind bend, at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#73</u> I am concerned that without a kerb it could be dangerous.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Our current preference is to have a low kerb. We will take HCC advice on the optimum safe kerb configuration.</p>
<p><u>Form#74</u> The only on-road footway on the south side of Kings Hill (1-39 Kings Hill) that I would support is by white-lining only (as in place now). No raised kerb or pavement.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Our current preference is to have a low kerb (c.20mm). We will take HCC advice on the optimum safe kerb configuration. We think it is important for the on-road footway to have a different coloured surface, to make it well-defined and eye-catching, denoting where pedestrians should be expected and respected. We believe the current twin white lines on Kings Hill are too narrowly spaced and need to be replaced by a wider on-road footway.</p>
<p><u>Form#83</u> Yes to the footpath but we have concerns as we live very close to where this will be implemented.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. Your concerns are set out at Q5.</p>
<p><u>Form#84</u> No, not without an agreed scheme that covers the entirety of Kings Hill. This section is relatively straight, has reasonable visibility and is already served by a virtual pathway. It is unclear that the proposed partial scheme represents a material improvement that justifies its cost.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We believe it is important for the on-road footway to have a different coloured surface, to make it well-defined and eye-catching, denoting where pedestrians should be expected and respected. We believe the current twin white lines on Kings Hill are too narrowly spaced and need to be replaced by a wider on-road footway.</p>
<p><u>Form#92</u></p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p>

<p>This part of Kings Hill already has areas on which pedestrians can walk – the corner of the road by the post box is the area of concern – can the tarmac be changed to red to indicate a danger, and/or amend the speed to 20mph for that section of Kings Hill. A footway potentially creates a false sense of security for a pedestrian as vehicles will still continue to speed.</p>	<p>We believe it is important for the on-road footway to have a different coloured surface, to make it well-defined and eye-catching, denoting where pedestrians should be expected and respected. We believe the current twin white lines on Kings Hill are too narrowly spaced and need to be replaced by a wider on-road footway. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety, around the blind bend, at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#100</u> Yes AND No. The road is dangerous, but making it narrower could possibly make it more of a hazard.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage. If it cannot be done safely, it won't be built.</p>
<p><u>Form#106</u> On road pavements in the narrow parts, these will only force traffic towards the middle of the road leading to very unsafe conditions for both pedestrians and vehicles. At present traffic does not generally slow when any obstruction is encountered, it merely pulls to the side of the road i.e. where the footpath might be. The rule of the road is to face oncoming traffic. This scheme encourages the opposite when walking in one direction.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Where there are on-road footways, the carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other as now, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians.</p>
<p><u>Form#108</u> We would not be in favour of a raised footway in [this] section as it would cause problems with the flow of 2 way traffic. Visibility would also be poor. Also, due to the amount of trees and flooding that we have, I don't think the upkeep and visibility of the path would be maintained. We don't think the path system can work due to the road width that cannot be changed. Possibly coloured tarmac to "nudge" drivers to keep across slightly but as you say with the number of cars using the road the path will be ignored most of the time and the expense couldn't be justified.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We provisionally proposed a footway with a very low kerb (20) that would be easy for a vehicle to mount if necessary. Where an on-road footway is proposed, the carriageway width (including on-road footway) will not be reduced, so that vehicles will still be able to pass each other (and other road users) much as now, but the on-road footway is designed to lead to higher priority and consideration given to pedestrians. And, as part of the existing carriageway, visibility would be as good as visibility of the existing roadside, with debris tending to be washed away by surface water. We would not expect the footway to be ignored - the expectation is that the on-road footway, together with appropriate new traffic signage, will itself cause vehicles to drive more slowly and cautiously in this section than they do now.</p>
<p><b>Q.5 Do you have any other comments on the proposed new on-road footway on Kings Hill?</b></p>	
<p><u>Form#4</u> It might be even better to put the footway off-road in this section, as there seems to be plenty of HCC land/verge available on the south side. Especially around the inside of the sharp bend at the bottom of Kings Hill.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> On Kings Hill one aim for the on-road footway is to slow traffic through apparent road narrowing. If, following discussion with HCC at the detailed design stage, it is concluded that a safe on-road footway is not possible at all points, then the option of stretches of off-road footway on HCC-owned land may be revisited – especially in connection with the bend.</p>
<p><u>Form#7</u> How are these footways going to be signed to warn traffic? Are they covered in the Highway Code anywhere?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> There will need to be appropriate warning signs about these footways, and we expect HCC to specify what they should be. The Highway Code is soon to be updated to place greater onus on those who could do the most damage to avoid a collision with a pedestrian.</p>
<p><u>Form#9</u> Initially this type of "painted on coloured asphalt" on-road demarcation is clear but fairly quickly with time, wear and tear and grime they tend to become much less defined and this causes concern</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Agreed. Our preference is to use coloured surfacing material i.e. coloured throughout the top 40 mm of the footway (as is the case in the Dorset example highlighted), which should be longer-lasting.</p>
<p><u>Form#10</u></p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p>

The surface of the footway should be such that it will be uncomfortable to drive on – not impossible to allow car to pass lorry etc – but only at very slow speed. If you go to rural villages in Holland they have this type of thing well sorted out. France too ...	This can be considered (examples welcome). But the surface will need to be conducive to walking by pedestrians of all ages and for use by cyclists, and will need to be approved by HCC.
<u>Form#11</u> Having moved to Beech from Rowledge which is an example used here, we have first hand experience of it working.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#12</u> I frequently use the road as a pedestrian, to go up to the woods, down to the village Hall, to walk to or from Alton town centre, or to visit neighbours. I always feel vulnerable to passing fast traffic, and I have had several close shaves. The issues are fast cars in both directions, poor visibility due to bends, and, in several places, nowhere to escape due to high banks. I think the proposed on-road footway is an excellent and pragmatic solution which will make the road appear like a single-track road, forcing drivers to slow down and look for and avoid pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#13</u> This is a great idea and the optimum solution for safe sharing of the carriageway by both pedestrians and motor vehicles in this residential area.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#15</u> Where feasible there should be places where the footpath is widened to allow safe passing.	<u>Council Response</u> We don't expect that there will be much, if any, scope for widening the on-road footway beyond 1.5m. We expect that pedestrians will be able to pass each other easily by stepping off the footway, if necessary, during the frequent gaps in traffic.
<u>Form#18</u> I think a white line would also help the on road path be seen as a separation in the dark.	<u>Council Response</u> This is something that can be considered in the detailed design, in consultation with HCC.
<u>Form#19</u> Whilst happy with the proposed solution there is sufficient off-road space owned by Hampshire Highways in this section that could enable an alternative pathway – subject to support from local householders which may be the stumbling block.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety at the detailed design stage.
<u>Form#21</u> Anything that slows traffic and creates a safer space for walkers would be an improvement.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#23</u> This proposal is eminently sensible and there are no other viable options that would be acceptable to the village.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#26</u> Make the kerb as high as possible so drivers really have to carefully bump up it or risk damaging an alloy wheel, especially relevant to the idiots who drive at very high speed!	<u>Council Response</u> We will take HCC advice on the optimum kerb configuration.
<u>Form#27</u> The curb should be as high as possible to protect pedestrians from speeding cars.	<u>Council Response</u> We will take HCC advice on the optimum kerb configuration. It will, however, be necessary for a vehicle to be able to mount the kerb in order to pass oncoming traffic, where necessary.
<u>Form#35</u> I feel this stretch is less of a priority due to wider road and better visibility for drivers and pedestrians. The corner (bottom of hill) and steep winding upper stretch up to the abbey are the most dangerous sections as pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> We agree that this is low on the priority list for the reasons you give plus the lower actual and potential pedestrian numbers on Kings Hill. And we have deferred the upper winding stretch (i.e. it has the lowest priority of all) because of expected low pedestrian usage. Great care will need to be taken to achieve a safe solution at the 'corner'.
<u>Form#36</u>	<u>Council Response</u>



Will need road signage warning traffic of “pedestrians on road” before the blind corner	We agree that warning signage will be needed, to be agreed with HCC.
<u>Form#39</u> As I walk that way quite regularly delivering the Beech News I would support anything that makes walking on the road safer.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#47</u> Whilst I frequently walk within Beech and hence personally I would benefit from such a path, the vast majority of road-users on [Kings Hill] are motorists and the needs of the majority should prevail.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, but we would contend that motorists’ preferences should not totally eliminate the needs of residents who wish to walk in their own village. A better balance needs to be struck.
<u>Form#51</u> Imperative that villagers can walk safely, especially with young children and dogs.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#52</u> We definitely need a 20mph zone. We live on the first corner and have had several near misses of vehicles speeding round the roads where they have zero visibility. It is only a matter of time! Electric cars are more dangerous as you can’t hear them coming!	<u>Council Response</u> Visibility around the bend at the bottom of Kings Hill is an issue that will not be solved by the proposed footways scheme. So far we have not considered a 20mph limit on Kings Hill as visibility is generally better for pedestrians (and refuge verges more available) than in the village centre. What you are describing seems more of a problem for vehicles pulling out onto the road than for pedestrians crossing the road (who can choose where to cross, for better visibility). When HCC’s policy changes and we are able to discuss 20mph limits with them, we can certainly discuss too the problem you identify.
<u>Form#53</u> On-road footways are not ideal but they would be a great improvement over “nothing at all”. I would feel much safer using it than walking on the road as we have to now.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#54</u> The way forward is to get residents to give up some land to build a proper footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> On Kings Hill one aim for the on-road footway is to slow traffic through apparent road narrowing. If, following discussion with HCC at the detailed design stage, it is concluded that a safe on-road footway is not possible at all points, then the option of stretches of off-road footway on HCC-owned land may be revisited.
<u>Form#55</u> Much needed from a safety point of view.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#56</u> Yes, excellent plan.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#63</u> Entirely appropriate, particularly if coupled with a 20mph speed limit. This should be the approach throughout the entire length of the village.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The current proposal is not to extend a 20mph zone through the entire village, but this would be a matter for discussion with HCC if and when their policy changes..
<u>Form#69</u> The light is very bad on occasions when the sun is setting, particularly in winter. Visibility is also an issue at night.	<u>Council Response</u> The visibility of the on-road footway at night, in vehicle headlights, is an issue that must be considered during the detailed design.
<u>Form#70</u> Whilst I fully support the proposals for improvement of the footways, I cannot support the exclusion of the final 400m section of Kings Hill. It might well have been removed with the consent of the Parish Council but to meet with the overall intent to provide safer non-vehicular travel for the WHOLE VILLAGE, then the whole village MUST be included. I further make the same point as previously regarding the enforcement of existing speed limits: these improvements will not be safe unless and until the speed limit is either enforced or adhered to.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council deferred the final 400m of Kings Hill after HCC declared, in its initial Safety Audit, the proposed on-road footway unsafe in that section. Rather than hold the whole process up, we decided to find out in this consultation what the appetite is for an off-road footway in that section – see Q10 – before going back to HCC with a new proposal for that section. Speed enforcement is down to the police, whose operations we cannot control. But we do lobby them and they regularly commit resources to Beech speed traps.

<u>Form#72</u> Need a footway ASAP.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#73</u> I do believe there should be a footway and support this but am concerned that without a kerb of some sort it would be ignored by thoughtless drivers.	<u>Council Response</u> Our current preference is to have a low kerb. We will take HCC advice on the optimum safe kerb configuration.
<u>Form#80</u> Super important given dangerous traffic.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#81</u> Again, the on-road footway is the only realistic option for this section of road.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#83</u> Concerned that as you approach 1 Kings Hill (driving towards Medstead) you're driving round a blind bend at this point. Drivers coming down from Medstead often drive over the middle of the road at this bend despite there being hashed white lines in the middle of the road. Drivers coming up the road drive towards the middle of the road as the woodland is overgrown and encroaches the highway. If a pedestrian was standing near the start of the footpath as displayed in your plans then there is a potential accident blackspot with cars breaking and potentially running into pedestrians, or vehicles swerving (to avoid pedestrians) into the centre of the road and crashing into oncoming traffic. The traffic coming down from Medstead needs to be slowed in some way.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety, around the blind bend, at the detailed design stage.
<u>Form#84</u> Please can the committee publish the assessment it did which resulted in the selection of the 'South Perrott scheme, with the low-height kerb'. The benefits of this scheme are not clear to us. In particular we are concerned about the introduction of a mid-carriage kerb for several reasons: - does this represent a trip hazard for runners/walkers, especially during times of poorer visibility for example rain, low sun, early evening and obviously night time? - does this represent a hazard for cyclists? - given that road vehicles will inevitably need to cross this kerb on a regular basis, how resilient will the kerb be and, in particular, how resilient will the road along either edge be given the numerous examples of eroded road surface throughout Beech? - would these issues be further exacerbated by obscuring caused by fallen leaves and/or obstruction caused by the stones and other debris that inevitably follow heavy rain? In addition, how would the on-road footways impact the already poor drainage on Beech's roads?	<u>Council Response</u> The provisional selection of the kerbed on-road footway was based upon (i) its perceived superior distinctiveness in demarcating the 'shared space' of the on-road footway from the rest of the carriageway, and (ii) the its successful operation (for over 9 years) on an A-road in South Perrott, Dorset, to the satisfaction of the residents. The Working Group will carefully examine your concerns about the safety of cyclists and others with respect to the kerb, and the implications of debris and surface drainage. We are confident that, through careful design, a safe separation between the road surface and on-road footway can be achieved. At the detailed design stage we will take the advice of HCC (who ultimately have the responsibility for the highway and its safety) on the configuration of a kerb and all of these other matters.
<u>Form#92</u> Would you be able to explain, by having an on-road footway – what are the legal implications for parking on / over it? Is an on-road footway classed as the same as a traditional footway i.e. you are unable legally to be able to park on it? People regularly park to either purchase eggs, use the postbox, or park outside properties on the area that is proposed to have the on-road footway (4). You need to explain what the legal implications are for creating an on road footway as this will impact on the consultation. This question has been asked previously.	<u>Council Response</u> As we understand it, an on-road footway is legally part of the carriageway, and so at this location it would not be illegal to park on it. In practice, parking on the road is infrequent in this area, and we don't foresee difficulties with pedestrians negotiating around parked cars (any more than there are now).
<u>Form#95</u> On-road footpath may not be a perfect solution as vehicles naturally speed up and down this steep section and may have to take avoiding action as people and cars exit driveways. Are other traffic calming measures being considered for this section? If not, please can they be taken into account.	<u>Council Response</u> This section would be a good location for the periodic positioning of a fixed Community SpeedWatch camera, should that come to fruition. Current HCC policy is not to support new physical traffic calming measures such speed bumps or pinch points.
<u>Form#96</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

The current lack of a footway is a significant safety issue and there is a very real danger of pedestrian injury or even fatality.	Noted.
<u>Form#100</u> Any scheme must be 100% certain that it will not create more problems than it is trying to resolve.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.

**Q.6A Do you support the provision of a new off-road footway alongside the eastern section of Bushy Leaze Wood (opposite 100-158 Medstead Road)?**

Total responses: - YES 99 (90%) NO 11 (10%)  
 Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 12 (92%) NO 1 (8%)  
 Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 27 (96%) NO 1 (4%)  
 Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 15 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
 Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 8 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
 Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 3 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
 Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 1 (14%) NO 6 (86%)  
 Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 24 (89%) NO 3 (11%)  
 Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 9 (100%) NO 0 (0%)

**Q.6B If 'No', please state why. How could the proposals be changed to gain your support?**

<u>Form#10</u> I think that this length of road is a very easy speeding section – fewer driveways and woodland, not drives, on the S side. I would prefer to see the option used also to narrow the road here too, with an on-road slightly raised walkway, with an uncomfortable driving surface. Also once we have a pavement, then we lose the priority that pedestrians have over the cars, which will now be driving fast with fewer likely on-road “obstructions”. I would prefer this to taking the footpath off the road here. I think we should do all possible to make it less attractive to use Beech as a rat-run for those living to the west of Beech; making the passage through Beech slow and likely to have to stop to make way for a car coming the other way will influence these drivers to use the proper trunk roads – the A31, and A339	<u>Council Response</u> This is a straight section of road with good visibility and our judgement is that narrowing the road here would not necessarily reduce traffic speeds. There is also a continuous roadside bank here, which allows no pedestrian refuge from an on-road footway <i>in extremis</i> . We have therefore preferred to remove pedestrians from the carriageway completely, because there is sufficient available roadside land to be able to do so. The on-road footway in the village centre (and potentially Kings Hill) should provide the deterrent to through traffic that you are seeking.
<u>Form#34</u> The proposals are unnecessary, would be a waste of precious resources and would result in ecological damage and loss of wildlife habitat and bio-diversity.	<u>Council Response</u> We will decide upon the need for this footway based upon the responses to this consultation. We would contend that the loss of habitat etc caused by a 1.5m wide roadside footway at this woodland location would be relatively very small.
<u>Form#60</u> I see very little point in creating an off road footpath at public expense that links to a private footpath that may be closed by the owner at any point in the future.	<u>Council Response</u> This section of footway runs from the village centre to the main entrance to Bushy Leaze Wood, a relatively well-used route in its own right.
<u>Form#61</u> This would not address the main issue which is volume and speed of traffic.	<u>Council Response</u> We have taken the view that it is difficult to get traffic to reduce speed further on this straight stretch of road (with HCC not supporting physical obstructions such as speed bumps) and so the best solution for pedestrians is to get them off the carriageway. Regarding traffic volume, we believe that the “narrowing effect” of the proposed on-road footway in the village centre should prove some deterrent against drivers using the village as a cut-through to the A339.
<u>Form#63</u> It is imperative that there is a single clear and consistent scheme throughout the village that motorists can understand and adhere to. This is not served by a section of on-road footpath followed by a section of off-road footpath followed by another section of on-road footpath. Not only is this confusing for motorists, it encourages them to greater speed where the ‘on-road’ section ends and the ‘off-road’	<u>Council Response</u> We have taken the view that it is difficult to get traffic to reduce speed on sections D & E, these being relatively straight, relatively narrow (in section E) stretches of road, with good visibility and a rural feel (i.e. not many houses roadside). And so the best solution for pedestrians in these sections is

<p>section starts with the consequence they will be travelling even faster when they reach the next on-road footpath section. It puts all pedestrians in greater jeopardy and particularly those using sections D&amp;E.</p> <p>The problem is the control of speeding drivers and this should be the focus of the solution throughout the village. Pedestrians are the victims of reckless driving; it is not their behaviour that needs to change. Their rights as road users need to be respected.</p> <p>A consistent on-road footpath is essential to encourage better driver behaviour; providing a central section of the village where drivers can revert to faster driving is not the solution and tacitly acknowledges that residents in sections D&amp;E will have to continue to put up with speeding drivers.</p>	<p>to get them off the carriageway onto off-road footways.</p> <p>Note: We already have a rudimentary form of on-road footway in section D (the twin white lines). While it has improved matters by making drivers more aware of pedestrians, it has not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines.</p> <p>Pedestrians are fairly infrequent in sections D &amp; E at present, so vehicles are already not usually impeded by pedestrians. So we believe that there will be no significant change to vehicle speeds on this stretch if pedestrians are taken off-road altogether.</p> <p>In sections D &amp; E, since current HCC policy is not to support new physical obstructions such as speed bumps or build-outs, enforcement of the 30mph speed limit is a task for police speed traps or, if we can get it, suitably deployed Community SpeedWatch cameras. But both depend on police willingness to provide support, and that is something that we cannot guarantee over the medium and long term.</p>
<p><u>Form#78</u> [Poor in] cost/benefit [terms].</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We believe that taking pedestrians off the road would be beneficial for residents, if available funds permit its construction.</p>
<p><u>Form#83</u> Yes to a footpath, but should it be on or off road? Can you get consent from the Forestry Commission for the footpath to be off road? Also, that must surely be one of the faster sections of road through Beech as it is straight, so don't you also need traffic calming?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> There is a wide HCC-owned strip of land alongside the road at this section, more than enough for an off-road footway.</p> <p>HCC's current policy is not to install new physical traffic calming measures. So taking pedestrians off-road here is the best way to improve their safety.</p>
<p><u>Form#95</u> Off-Road path removes and reduces woodland and will change the whole vista and nature of Beech village. There is considerable doubt that permission will be granted by the Forestry Commission for an off-road path where it crosses their land – this jeopardises the proposed off-road path in this section. Additionally, removal of the current on-road solution will widen the road in this section and encourage increased vehicle speeds – the reverse of what we are trying to achieve. Drivers exiting the constricted sections B and C will then be presented with an entirely open road (section D) and speed up excessively to make up for lost time in the previous sections.</p> <p>If an on-road path is adopted for this section (which we recommend - see later), it should be wider than at present to avoid drivers facing a widened road as they exit section C, which encourages increased speeding.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> There is a wide HCC-owned strip of land alongside the road at this section, well clear of the woodland, more than enough for an off-road footway.</p> <p>We have taken the view that it is difficult to get traffic to reduce speed in this section, being a relatively straight stretch of road, with good visibility and a rural feel (i.e. not many houses roadside). And so the best solution for pedestrians in this section is to get them off the carriageway onto off-road footways.</p> <p>We already have a rudimentary form of on-road footway here (the twin white lines). While it has improved matters by making drivers more aware of pedestrians, it has not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines.</p> <p>Pedestrians are fairly infrequent in this section at present, so vehicles are already not usually impeded by pedestrians. So we believe that there will be no significant change to vehicle speeds on this stretch if pedestrians are taken off-road altogether. In the absence of extensive physical traffic calming measures, this will always be an open stretch of road.</p>

<p><u>Form#100</u> Yes AND No. If the footpath was higher than the road would it have railings to stop people/children/cyclists/dogs falling into the road?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We would avoid the need for railings wherever possible, as railings would tend to spoil the rural feel of the village. The need for railings is a function of path height above the road and distance from the road. In this section we don't expect it to be an issue, but we will be guided by HCC during the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#103</u> Pedestrians on Medstead Road should not be encouraged.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted. However, many residents <b>do</b> wish to walk in the village, nor unreasonably, and the purpose of the project is to facilitate them doing so in a safer manner than they can now. In this section, the proposal is to move them off the road itself.</p>
<p><u>Form#104</u> The new footway should continue on-road all the way up Medstead Road/Kings Hill as this offers continuity re: narrowing the road thereby reducing the speed of traffic. In hours of darkness an on-road footway provides a safer, more exposed walking route for pedestrians.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We have taken the view that it is difficult to get traffic to reduce speed in this section, being a relatively straight stretch of road, with good visibility and a rural feel (i.e. not many houses roadside). And so the best solution for pedestrians in this section is to get them off the carriageway onto off-road footways. We already have a rudimentary form of on-road footway here (the twin white lines). While it has improved matters by making drivers more aware of pedestrians, it has not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines. The proposed off-road footway here is right next to, and fully exposed to, the road.</p>
<p><u>Form#107</u> Any off road footway will lead to a rapid increase in vehicle speed after the pinch points of the village centre and Kings Hill. It is likely to spoil the natural rural appearance of the village as a whole and is totally not required. If any footway is required then continue the on road path throughout the village. Drivers might not be confused and vehicle speed might even reduce.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We have taken the view that it is difficult to get traffic to reduce speed in this section, being a relatively straight stretch of road, with good visibility and a rural feel (i.e. not many houses roadside). And so the best solution for pedestrians in this section is to get them off the carriageway onto off-road footways. We already have a rudimentary form of on-road footway here (the twin white lines). While it has improved matters by making drivers more aware of pedestrians, it has not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines. Traffic already accelerates uphill after exiting the village centre, and downhill from the Kings Hill bend, usually with no pedestrians in sight, and so we don't believe an off-road footway will cause traffic speeds to increase. We don't believe a simple rural path, similar to that descending to the A339, is out of keeping with the village's rural appearance.</p>
<p><b>Q.7 Do you have any other comments on the proposed new off-road footway at Bushy Leaze Wood opposite 100-158 Medstead Road?</b></p>	
<p><u>Form#9</u> There is already a path leading up from 91 Medstead Road that then runs parallel to Medstead Road as far as the Bushy Leaze carpark.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We believe that most pedestrians would prefer a roadside path for convenience and security reasons.</p>

<p>Would this not provide a more cost effective alternative? [Later clarification: We were referring to forest path further back in the woodland.]</p>	<p>Also, Forestry England have indicated that they do not currently favour a surfaced path within the woodland.</p>
<p><u>Form#10</u> Not sure how this will be engineered to pass over the flood defences on the side of the road, for this “winterbourne” – they must not be filled in</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The ‘grips and ditches’ will be preserved. The grips (gaps from the road into the ditches) may need to be edged (with kerbstones) or even bridged (with slabs).</p>
<p><u>Form#12</u> I think this off-road footway is an essential component in the plan to provide an end-to-end walking route for the village and will make it much safer to take exercise routes that involve Bushy Leaze woods, and to visit friends higher up in the village. As it is possible to take the route off the road, it makes good sense to do so as the cost will be lower, and the protection for pedestrians better as compared with on-road options.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#13</u> This is by far the best solution to ensure safe movements of both motor vehicles and pedestrians.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#16</u> I would like to see the offset white lines retained as it is an aid to influence drivers from excessive speeding. Also, costing of footpath bridges over considerable number of rainwater run-offs might involve extra costing? <u>Form#17</u> Retain current road line markings.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We see no harm in retaining the existing pair of white lines, but the final decision will be with HCC. Yes, bridging over rainwater ‘grips’ will definitely be needed and the construction cost will reflect that.</p>
<p><u>Form#18</u> The costs outlined seem quite high when a number of villagers recently managed to clear the higher section of off road footpath, is this a certain construction method and if so will that be carried on up the cleared path to be of a certain standard so roots and weeds don’t grow back.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> This section of off-road footway would be on HCC land and so would need to be constructed to meet HCC standards, including being levelled and with an artificial surface (unlike the cleared path referred to). The preliminary cost estimates reflect this.</p>
<p><u>Form#19</u> As a pedestrian who often uses the existing off-road pathway at the bottom end of Medstead Road this proposed solution by the woods will enhance the pleasure and comfort of walking in this part of the village. For me it is an obvious and highly beneficial option.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#23</u> This proposal is eminently sensible and there are no other viable options that would be acceptable to the village.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#25</u> This will get pedestrians out of the flow of the traffic and therefore much safer. Maintenance is a challenge – the maintenance of the footway at the lower end of the village (from the A339 to 27 Medstead Road) needs to be done regularly in order for it to remain usable for all pedestrians – eg pushchairs, elderly, disabled. There also needs to be clear signage as quite often I see people walking down the road rather than on the footway.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Maintenance responsibility for this off-road (but roadside) footway will need to be agreed with HCC (whose land it is). Maintenance needs will be a factor in its detailed design, and the experience with the footpath to the A339 is useful. We expect the footway to be close enough to the road not to be missed.</p>
<p><u>Form#26</u> Make sure its sufficiently paved/finished for winter use so shoes don’t get wrecked and buggys/wheelchairs can use it otherwise it’s no good for winter use.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Agreed.</p>
<p><u>Form#27</u> The off-road footway may not be accessible to pushchairs or wheelchairs. I suggest also extending the on road footway in this area.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We would prefer to build an off-road footway that is accessible to pushchairs and wheelchairs. It is unlikely that we could get permission and raise funds to put in place both options.</p>
<p><u>Form#28</u> If I am to use it then it will have to be properly surfaced (so I don’t have to wear walking boots, and it won’t get muddy) and be properly</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Agreed about the path surface. As the footway would be at the roadside it would receive virtually</p>

lit by the streetlamps to be safe at night/on winter evenings. Mostly when I walk down to the village now I use the path higher up and only in daylight.	the same street light illumination as the carriageway. Changing the street lighting to make the footway better illuminated at night at all points along its length may be a future improvement project.
<u>Form#31</u> Would need to be linked properly with the western section at the forest parking area.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed, a good surface across the entrance to Bushy Leaze Wood would be desirable, but that is probably the responsibility of Forestry England.
<u>Form#34</u> Same comment as for Q1B.	<u>Council Response</u> As for Q1B.
<u>Form#35</u> Strongly support this option where possible. Pedestrians will use the path if the path surface is maintained. If allowed to become muddy or overgrown pedestrians will revert to the road. Much pleasanter than on-road alternative.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#39</u> As a dog walker using Bushy Leaze I would welcome any safe walking paths.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#40</u> This would be most welcome.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#41</u> This path is very much needed to ensure the safety of villagers who are pedestrians and/or would like to be pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#44</u> It will make a pleasant walk for residents.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#47</u> A safer, smoother, all weather surface would be a great incentive to use the path more. Could it be lit at night?	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed about the path surface. As the footway would be at the roadside it would receive virtually the same street light illumination as the carriageway. Changing the street lighting to make the footway better illuminated at night at all points along its length may be a future improvement project.
<u>Form#51</u> Excellent idea – proper pavements.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#53</u> Great option.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#54</u> Should be within the woodland no need to urbanise the area. It would be good to create a 'pedestrian crossing' to allow safe crossing from the Ackender Wood path to the rec path (Hants Footpath No 712). This would potentially also slow down traffic as it enters in the more fully populated village centre.	<u>Council Response</u> The path is at the roadside because it is for people walking up and down the village, not for excursions into the woods. A roadside path will be considered more secure by some users. The intention is to design the path so as to be sympathetic to its rural environment, much like the path to the A339. Pedestrian road crossings are generally only justifiable where there are no or few natural breaks in the traffic that allow pedestrians to cross the road – which is not the case on Medstead Road. Such a crossing would also urbanise the area.
<u>Form#59</u> I would like to have clear visibility of the road from the off road path for safety reasons, as I would not wish to walk through woodland when it is dark or when secluded by leaves on the trees, also with some sort of lighting.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The intention is for the footway to be on HCC land within 2m of the road, with a controlled verge between the footway and the road. The footway would receive virtually the same street light illumination as the carriageway.
<u>Form#61</u> The sudden disappearance of the visible path as it change from on-road to off-road would see an immediate increase in vehicle speeds as drivers assume it is 'safe' to accelerate.	<u>Council Response</u> Traffic already accelerates as it exits the village centre (going uphill) and as it exits the Kings Hill bend (going downhill). We believe that any changes

	in this respect will be marginal, and of less concern to pedestrians if they are off the carriageway.
<u>Form#64</u> While this may inconvenience some through possible limited loss of privacy, it is for the personal safety of many.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. We do not believe that a well-designed roadside footway in this section need impinge upon privacy any more than pedestrians on the road.
<u>Form#67</u> As long as not used by horses.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, but it may not be possible to prevent horses from using it. The surface may need to be able to accommodate horses.
<u>Form#69</u> It may encourage too many people from newer developments at Brick Kiln Lane and Chawton Park Farm to wander into Beech, altering the quiet village aura.	<u>Council Response</u> Those from the Chawton Park Farm area would walk through Bushy Leaze Wood whether or not there is a new footway. But yes, there is the possibility that others from West Alton might occasionally choose to take a walk through Beech.
<u>Form#70</u> I support this only on the understanding that the woods remain as woodland and that the area is not manicured in any way (as per the surface to the A339). I do not support the use of lighting or kerbing or any further urban/suburbanisation.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. This footway will be at the side of the road, not in the woodland. We plan to have a green verge between the footway and road, consisting of the same wild plant life that is already there, which should just need periodic strimming to keep it under control.
<u>Form#72</u> Definitely needed.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#74</u> I do support this off-road footway if the area is wide enough to support a sensible path without the need for costly works AND if it doesn't impact on the residents.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you. There is ample roadside HCC land in this section for an adequate roadside path, close to the 'twin white lines' already used by pedestrians.
<u>Form#75</u> To encourage use by a wide range of residents the path should provide easy walking all year round, not just in dry conditions .	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#81</u> Yes, but if this proves to be too expensive to build because of the need to bridge the grips and soak-aways.	<u>Council Response</u> We are reasonably confident that the bridging solution should be affordable.
<u>Form#84</u> This must be a well maintained, robust all weather surface.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#95</u> The proposed off-road footpath only allows for entrance and egress of the path opposite 100 Medstead Road and the entrance to Bushy Leaze, therefore residents along that stretch will have to either walk up or down the road to access the footpath or jump up or down across a dangerous verge from or into the road.	<u>Council Response</u> This consultation is on a conceptual design. Intermediate access points to off-road paths, opposite individual houses, will be addressed at the detailed design stage.
<u>Form#96</u> My earlier comments apply. This is a village community with a lack of pedestrian facilities combined with regular speeding vehicles and narrow road sections – a very hazardous combination.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#105</u> As Highways land appears to be available, this should include new landscaping to soften the appearance.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, but a rural/natural appearance should be maintained.
<u>Form#107</u> Any pathway in the woods should be screened from the road.	<u>Council Response</u> The footway in this section will not be in the woods, but on the wide HCC-owned strip at the roadside. Many walkers value good visibility from the road for safety/security reasons. We don't believe an unscreened roadside path in this section detracts from the privacy of the houses opposite.
<u>Form#110</u>	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.



Personal experience of two cars passing & 2 pedestrians. All at the same point in relatively narrow road. Very close encounter with car, and real danger of being hit.	
--	--

**Q.8A Do you support the provision of a new off-road footway alongside the western section of Bushy Leaze Wood (opposite 174-188 Medstead Road)?**

Total responses: - YES 99 (90%) NO 11 (10%) Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 12 (92%) NO 1 (8%) Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 27 (96%) NO 1 (4%) Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 15 (100%) NO 0 (0%) Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 8 (100%) NO 0 (0%) Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 3 (100%) NO 0 (0%) Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 1 (14%) NO 6 (86%) Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 24 (89%) NO 3 (11%) Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 9 (100%) NO 0 (0%)
--

**Q.8B If 'No', please state why. How could the proposals be changed to gain your support?**

<u>Form#10</u> I think that this length of road is a very easy speeding section – fewer driveways and woodland, not drives, on the S side. I would prefer to see the option used also to narrow the road here too, with an on-road slightly raised walkway, with an uncomfortable driving surface. Also once we have a pavement, then we lose the priority that pedestrians have over the cars, which will now be driving fast with fewer likely on-road “obstructions”. I would prefer this to taking the footpath off the road here. I think we should do all possible to make it less attractive to use Beech as a rat-run for those living to the west of Beech; making the passage through Beech slow and likely to have to stop to make way for a car coming the other way will influence these drivers to use the proper trunk roads – the A31, and A339	<u>Council Response</u> This is a relatively straight section of road with good visibility and our judgement is that narrowing the road here would not necessarily reduce traffic speeds. There is also a continuous roadside bank here, which makes it tricky for pedestrians to move off an on-road footway onto the verge if circumstances demand. We have therefore preferred to remove pedestrians from the carriageway completely, because there is sufficient roadside verge to be able to do so. The on-road footway in the village centre (and potentially Kings Hill) should provide the deterrent to through traffic that you are seeking.
<u>Form#34</u> The proposals are unnecessary, would be a waste of precious resources and would result in ecological damage and loss of wildlife habitat and bio-diversity.	<u>Council Response</u> We will decide upon the need for this footway based upon the responses to this consultation. We would contend that the loss of habitat etc caused by a 1.5m wide roadside footway at this woodland location would be relatively very small.
<u>Form#60</u> I see very little point in creating an off road footpath at public expense that links to a private footpath that may be closed by the owner at any point in the future. This issue could be mitigated if the owner of the private section of the footpath were to commit to the long term provision of the footpath by agreeing to a covenant on his land stating the footpath is permanent. In addition there are several properties that will suffer from privacy issues owing to the elevated nature of the footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> If and when the construction of this section of footway becomes a reality we will be in a position to engage with the owner of the private woodland footpath on this matter. As part of the detailed design stage we will address the privacy of the residents along this section.
<u>Form#61</u> Make the whole length of the foot path on-road to avoid drivers making assumptions about safe and unsafe stretches of the road.	<u>Council Response</u> The entire section from the Bushy Leaze entrance to the Kings Hill bend is a relatively straight, relatively narrow section of rural road with few houses and will have relatively low pedestrian traffic. Consequently we have taken the view that it would be difficult to get traffic to reduce speed on this section, even with a (usually empty) on-road footway in place, and so the best solution for pedestrians is to get them off the carriageway.
<u>Form#63</u> Providing a central section of the village where drivers can revert to faster driving is not the solution. A consistent on-road	<u>Council Response</u> We have taken the view that it is difficult to get traffic to reduce speed on sections D & E, these being relatively straight, relatively narrow (in section E) stretches of road,

<p>footpath is essential to encourage drivers to moderate their speed throughout the village not just at its two ends</p> <p>The scheme acknowledges that it may encourage speeding in sections D&amp;E, but chooses to disregard this as a necessary consequence of separating pedestrians and motorists, but the rights of pedestrians as <i>road users</i> need to be respected. The scheme also acknowledges the effectiveness of on-road footpaths elsewhere but chooses not to advocate them throughout the village.</p> <p>The problem is the control of speeding drivers and their observance of pedestrians; this should be the focus of the solution throughout the village. Pedestrians are the victims of reckless driving; it is not their behaviour that needs to change. This is yet another example of victims being advised to change their behaviour, not perpetrators (cf recent issues of violence against women!).</p>	<p>with good visibility and a rural feel (i.e. not many houses roadside). And so the best solution for pedestrians in these sections is to get them off the carriageway onto off-road footways.</p> <p>Note: We already have a rudimentary form of on-road footway in section D (the twin white lines). While it has improved matters by making drivers more aware of pedestrians, it has not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines.</p> <p>On-road footways are proposed in the village centre and on lower Kings Hill because they already have a more ‘built-up’ feel and an on-road footway will accentuate that impression, promoting more careful (and hopefully slower) driving. This is reinforced in the village centre by a twisty road with poor visibility. it’s also the case that in the village centre there is little available land either side of the road to put in an off-road footway – otherwise we are certain that the residents would be lobbying hard for one!</p> <p>Pedestrians are fairly infrequent in sections D &amp; E at present, so vehicles are already not usually impeded by pedestrians. So we believe that there will be no significant change to vehicle speeds on this stretch if pedestrians are taken off-road altogether.</p> <p>In sections D &amp; E, since HCC’s current policy is not to support new physical obstructions such as speed bumps or build-outs, enforcement of the 30mph speed limit is a task for police sped traps or, if we can get it, suitably deployed Community SpeedWatch cameras. But both depend on police willingness to provide support, and that is something that we cannot guarantee over the medium and long term.</p>
<p><u>Form#83</u> Yes, but surely that must be intrusive for residents in the houses opposite as it raised above road height at this point?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Avoiding a materially adverse effect on the privacy of the houses opposite will be a factor in the detailed design of the footway in this section.</p>
<p><u>Form#95</u> The existing on-road path up to this section has the effect of constraining vehicle speeds and any off-road footpath will inevitably lead to increased vehicle speed and the attendant dangers. Forestry Commission approval will again be required for this section.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The ‘twin white lines’ along section D have not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines.</p> <p>Pedestrians are infrequent on this stretch of road at present, so vehicles are already not usually impeded by pedestrians. So we believe that there will be no significant change to vehicle speeds on this stretch if pedestrians are taken off-road altogether.</p> <p>There is a strip of HCC land at the roadside that may be wide enough to construct an off-road footway. Whether we would need to impinge on Forestry England land will become apparent during the detailed design stage, and they will be consulted at that point if necessary.</p>
<p><u>Form#100</u> Yes AND No. If the footpath was higher than the road would it have railings to stop people/children/cyclists/dogs falling into the road?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We would avoid the need for railings wherever possible, as railings would tend to spoil the rural feel of the village. The need for railings is a function of path height above the road and distance from the road. In this section we don’t expect it to be an issue, but we will be guided by HCC during the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>Form#103</u></p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p>

<p>Pedestrians on Medstead Road should not be encouraged.</p>	<p>Noted. However, many residents <b>do</b> wish to walk in the village, nor unreasonably, and the purpose of the project is to facilitate them doing so in a safer manner than they can now. In this section, the proposal is to move them off the road itself.</p>
<p><u>Form#104</u> The new footway should continue on-road all the way up Medstead Road/Kings Hill as this offers continuity re: narrowing the road thereby reducing the speed of traffic. In hours of darkness an on-road footway provides a safer, more exposed walking route for pedestrians.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We have taken the view that it is difficult to get traffic to reduce speed in this section, being a gently curving stretch of road, with good visibility and a rural feel (i.e. not many houses roadside). And so the best solution for pedestrians in this section is to get them off the carriageway onto off-road footways. We already have a rudimentary form of on-road footway alongside part of Bushy Leaze Wood (the twin white lines). While it has improved matters by making drivers more aware of pedestrians, it has not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines. The proposed off-road footway here is close to the road and ideally will be fully exposed to the road.</p>
<p><u>Form#107</u> Any off road footway will lead to a rapid increase in vehicle speed after the pinch points of the village centre and Kings Hill. It is likely to spoil the natural rural appearance of the village as a whole and is totally not required. If any footway is required then continue the on road path throughout the village. Drivers might not be confused and vehicle speed might even reduce. With the addition of privacy issues where any pathway in the woods is higher than road level. No provision is being made to stopping scramble bikes and quad bikes from using these foot paths.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We have taken the view that it is difficult to get traffic to reduce speed in this section, being a gently curving stretch of road, with good visibility and a rural feel (i.e. not many houses roadside). And so the best solution for pedestrians in this section is to get them off the carriageway onto off-road footways. We already have a rudimentary form of on-road footway a little further down the road (the twin white lines). While it has improved matters by making drivers more aware of pedestrians, it has not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines. Traffic already accelerates uphill after exiting the village centre, and downhill from the Kings Hill bend, usually with no pedestrians in sight, and so we don't believe an off-road footway will cause traffic speeds to increase. We don't believe a simple rural path, similar to that descending to the A339, is out of keeping with the village's rural appearance. The privacy of the residents along this section will be addressed during the detailed design stage. We don't expect motorised bikes to use new highly visible, roadside off-road footways (do they in Medstead for example?), but we can assess the risk with HCC's county-wide knowledge and experience of putting in village roadside footways.</p>
<p><b>Q.9 Do you have any other comments on the proposed new off-road footway at Bushy Leaze Wood opposite 174-188 Medstead Road?</b></p>	
<p><u>Form#9</u> There is already a path leading up from the Bushy Leaze carpark to that virtually joins up with the newly created path on the privately owned section. Would this not provide a more cost effective alternative?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We believe that most pedestrians would prefer a roadside path for convenience and security reasons. Also, Forestry England have indicated that they do not currently favour a surfaced path within the woodland.</p>
<p><u>Form#10</u> Not sure how this will be engineered to pass over the flood defences on the side of the road, for this "winterbourne" – they must not be filled in</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> There are currently no drainage ditches on this stretch of road.</p>
<p><u>Form#12</u></p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p>

I think this off-road footway is an essential component in the plan to provide an end-to-end walking route for the village and will make it much safer to take exercise routes that involve Bushy Leaze woods, and to visit friends higher up in the village. As it is possible to take the route off the road, it makes good sense to do so as the cost will be lower, and the protection for pedestrians better as compared with on-road options.	Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#13</u> The footpath should not be used as an excuse to develop a parking area for the scout hut.	<u>Council Response</u> This project does not include any parking areas. Any parking area in the woodland would be a completely separate planning matter between the woodland owner and EHDC.
<u>Form#18</u> The costs outlined seem quite high when a number of villagers recently managed to clear the higher section of off road footpath, is this a certain construction method and if so will that be carried on up the cleared path to be of a certain standard so roots and weeds don't grow back.	<u>Council Response</u> This section of off-road footway would be on HCC land and so would need to be constructed to meet HCC standards, including being levelled and with an artificial surface (unlike the cleared path referred to). The preliminary cost estimates reflect this.
<u>Form#19</u> The same rationale exists for this section as it does for the previous lower end of Medstead Road. It gets my wholehearted support.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#23</u> There is concern the footpath will lead to a new parking area for access to the planned scout hut. This is entirely inappropriate and significantly affects the views of the woods from the house opposite.	<u>Council Response</u> This project does not include any parking areas. Any parking area in the woodland would be a completely separate planning matter between the woodland owner and EHDC.
<u>Form#25</u> This will get pedestrians out of the flow of the traffic and therefore much safer. Maintenance is a challenge – the maintenance of the footway at the lower end of the village (from the A339 to 27 Medstead Road) needs to be done regularly in order for it to remain usable for all pedestrians – eg pushchairs, elderly, disabled. There also needs to be clear signage as quite often I see people walking down the road rather than on the footway.	<u>Council Response</u> Maintenance responsibility for this off-road (but roadside) footway will need to be agreed with the landowner (HCC and/or Forestry England). Maintenance needs will be a factor in its detailed design, and the experience with the footpath to the A339 is useful. We expect the footway to be close enough to the road not to be missed.
<u>Form#26</u> Make sure its sufficiently paved/finished for winter use so shoes don't get wrecked and buggys/wheelchairs can use it otherwise it's no good for winter use.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#27</u> The off-road footway may not be accessible to pushchairs or wheelchairs. I suggest also extending the on road footway in this area.	<u>Council Response</u> We would prefer to build an off-road footway that is accessible to pushchairs and wheelchairs. It is unlikely that we could get permission and raise funds to put in place both options.
<u>Form#28</u> If I am to use it then it will have to be properly surfaced (so I don't have to wear walking boots, and it won't get muddy) and be properly lit by the streetlamps to be safe at night/on winter evenings. Mostly when I walk down to the village now I use the path higher up and only in daylight.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed about the path surface. As the footway is expected to be at the roadside it would receive virtually the same street light illumination as the carriageway. Changing the street lighting to make the footway better illuminated at night at all points along its length may be a future improvement project.
<u>Form#34</u> Same comment as for Q1B.	<u>Council Response</u> As for Q1B.
<u>Form#35</u> Strongly support this option where possible. Pedestrians will use the path if the path surface is maintained. If allowed to become muddy or overgrown pedestrians will revert to the road. Much pleasanter than on-road alternative.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#40</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

Again most welcome and with a firm walking/cycling surface.	Noted. The surface will be designed primarily for walkers, but probable cyclist use should be recognised too.
<u>Form#41</u> There is no choice but to have this.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#47</u> A safer, smoother, all weather surface would be a great incentive to use the path more. Could it be lit at night? Plus this is very uneven at its lower end making it pretty unsuitable for more elderly or less agile residents.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed about the path surface. As the footway is expected to be at the roadside it would receive virtually the same street light illumination as the carriageway. Changing the street lighting to make the footway better illuminated at night at all points along its length may be a future improvement project.
<u>Form#51</u> Anything that improves safety is important.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#53</u> Great option.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#54</u> The footway should remain within the woodland there is no need to urbanise the area.	<u>Council Response</u> The path is at (or near) the roadside because it is for people walking up and down the village, not for excursions into the woods. A roadside path will be considered more secure by some users. The intention is to design the path so as to be sympathetic to its rural environment, much like the path to the A339.
<u>Form#59</u> I would like to have clear visibility of the road from the off road path for safety reasons, as I would not wish to walk through woodland when it is dark or when secluded by leaves on the trees, also with some sort of lighting.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The current intention is for the footway to be on HCC land within 2m of the road, with a controlled verge between the footway and the road. The footway would receive virtually the same street light illumination as the carriageway.
<u>Form#61</u> Separating pedestrians and vehicles would encourage speeding by motorists creating air quality issues and more dangerous roads, particularly for those residents between 100-188 Medstead Road.	<u>Council Response</u> Pedestrians are very infrequent between 170 and 188 Medstead Road at present, so vehicles are already not usually impeded by pedestrians. We believe that there will be no significant change to vehicle speeds on this stretch if pedestrians are taken off-road altogether. Note: We already have a rudimentary form of on-road footway opposite 100-158 Medstead Road (the twin white lines). While it has improved matters by making drivers more aware of pedestrians, it has not noticeably reduced vehicle speeds when pedestrians are present, and many pedestrians still feel unsafe within those twin white lines.
<u>Form#63</u> The proposed footpath in section E across Song-Gi's land is at a considerable elevation from the road surface and is not accessible to residents on the north side of Medstead Road as far as the foot of Kings Hill. Above Bushy Leaze, the footpath is only accessible at each end and at one central point, nor should there be multiple access points which would make severe incursions into the woodland. The existing high embankments elsewhere on the south side of this section are further impediments to access. Residents here have little alternative other than to use the section of road that, under this proposal, would show no priority for pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> In the stretch of section E between (i) the Bushy Leaze entrance, and (ii) the ramp up to the private woodland, the current intention is for the footway to be on HCC land within 2m of the road, with a controlled verge between the footway and the road. There is no reason why the houses opposite this footway should not each have direct access straight across the road, which can be addressed at the next (detailed design) stage. One house cannot be accommodated in this way (no.194) as the bank to the private woodland opposite is too high; its residents would be faced with a 20m walk on the road to access the footway opposite no.188, a much better situation than pertains now.
<u>Form#64</u> While this may inconvenience some through possible limited loss of privacy, it is for the personal safety of many.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. We do not believe that a well-designed roadside footway in this section need impinge upon privacy any more than pedestrians on the road.
<u>Form#67</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

Again - not used by horses.	Noted, but it may not be possible, in practice, to prevent horses from using it. The surface may need to be able to accommodate horses.
<u>Form#69</u> As the path is in an elevated position it will be necessary to protect the privacy of houses opposite.	<u>Council Response</u> This section of footway may or may not be in an elevated position; detailed design will determine that. Either way, the privacy concerns of neighbours will be taken into account.
<u>Form#70</u> I support this only on the understanding that the woods remain as woodland and that the area is not manicured in any way (as per the surface to the A339). I do not support the use of lighting or kerbing or any further urban/suburbanisation.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. This footway will be close to the road, at the edge of the woodland. We plan to have a green verge or strip between the footway and road, consisting of the same wild plant life that is already there, which should just need periodic strimming and trimming to keep it under control.
<u>Form#74</u> I do support this off-road footway if the area is wide enough to support a sensible path without the need for costly works AND if it doesn't impact on the residents.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you. There is enough roadside HCC/Forestry England land in this section for an adequate path, close to the road where (a few) pedestrians already walk.
<u>Form#75</u> To encourage use by a wide range of residents the path should provide easy walking all year round, not just in dry conditions .	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#81</u> Ideally the footway should be separated from the road by sufficient space to develop a hedge, as at the bottom of Medstead Road.	<u>Council Response</u> Any need for a hedge will be determined during the detailed design stage. Some people would prefer to be visible from the road for safety/security reasons.
<u>Form#84</u> This must be a well maintained, robust all weather surface.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#95</u> The proposed off-road footpath only allows for entrance and egress of the path at the entrance to Bushy Leaze and at 1 Kings Hill, therefore residents along that whole stretch will have to either walk up or down the road to access the footpath or jump up or down across a dangerous verge from or into the road. The newly created access point opposite 188 Medstead Road is dangerous, people and animals emerge blind onto oncoming traffic [redacted] - the proposed off-road solution encourages this behaviour. Also, during the winter months, what happens when the off-road path, ie woodland path, is too dark for safe use? Pedestrians will then be forced back on to the road making a mockery of the off-road footpath. The proposed off-road path will compromise privacy for home owners opposite and increases the risk of burglary and opportunistic theft.	<u>Council Response</u> This consultation is on a conceptual design. Intermediate access points to off-road paths, opposite individual houses, will be addressed at the detailed design stage. There is already an intermediate access point opposite No.188 but, if the off-road footway running east from there to the Bushy Leaze entrance is formed, that access point will be much less used (only by Nos. 188, 190 and 194) than now. Passing pedestrians only use that access point now because they are transitioning from walking on the road to walking on the footpath in the private woodland. Lighting the woodland path will be a challenge (and may be expensive for the parish council to run), and it may be that it remains a less attractive route at night unless and until a future project tackles it. Meanwhile night users may use a torch for their safety on the path – much as night walkers in the road do now. In general we would expect the use of all the footways in darkness to be a fraction of their use in daylight. We understand the privacy concerns of local residents and these will be addressed at the detailed design stage.
<u>Form#98</u> Off the top of my head I can't remember the numbers. I regularly walk down the road with my dog. The pathway in the private woods is brilliant, however the bit which belongs to the Forestry Commission where recently trees have been cut down is almost a path but not quite, its fine if you have welly boots on only.	<u>Council Response</u> You are referring to the correct section. You were probably walking along the boundary between HCC and Forestry England land. The proposal is for an all-weather pathway there, or probably closer to the road.
<u>Form#107</u> Any pathway in the woods should be screened from the road.	<u>Council Response</u> The footway in this section will be on the edge of the woods, in the strip recently cleared by Forestry England, possibly straddling HCC and Forestry England land. Many

	walkers value good visibility from the road for safety/security reasons. But we understand the privacy concerns of local residents and these will be addressed at the detailed design stage.
<u>Form#110</u> Personal experience of two cars passing & 2 pedestrians. All at the same point in relatively narrow road. Very close encounter with car, and real danger of being hit.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.

**Q.10A Would you support the provision of a new off-road footway on the north verge/bank of Kings Hill, running from 72 Kings Hill to Alton Abbey (currently deferred)?**

Total responses: - YES 87 (79%) NO 15 (14%) Don't Know 8 (7%)  
 Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 10 (77%) NO 1 (8%) Don't Know 2 (15%)  
 Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 25 (89%) NO 1 (4%) Don't Know 2 (7%)  
 Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 12 (80%) NO 1 (7%) Don't Know 2 (13%)  
 Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 8 (100%) NO 0 (0%) Don't Know 0 (0%)  
 Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 3 (100%) NO 0 (0%) Don't Know 0 (0%)  
 Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 0 (0%) NO 6 (86%) Don't Know 1 (14%)  
 Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 20 (74%) NO 6 (22%) Don't Know 1 (4%)  
 Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 9 (100%) NO 0 (0%) Don't Know 0 (0%)

**Q.10B Is there a particular reason for your answer?**

<u>Form#4</u> No - We wish to preserve a gap between Beech & Medstead. Putting a footpath up into the gap may make it more likely that development in that gap may be approved.	<u>Council Response</u> This will be taken into consideration if and when the parish council decides whether to proceed with this section.
<u>Form#9</u> Yes - This is very dangerous corner to walk but it is appreciated this does present distinct engineering problems to overcome to provide a path.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed, although there appears to be sufficient width of HCC land for a path.
<u>Form#10</u> No - Lets make the road driving area narrower and less attractive to use by passing-though traffic – the road should be engineered to be more “access only”. But we do need the bus, and emergency vehicle access.	<u>Council Response</u> HCC's safety audit has rejected the concept of an on-road footway in this section.
<u>Form#12</u> Yes - I think it would be great to include the entire village in this scheme, and perhaps to link with longer walking routes in the Medstead area, but this is a lower priority for me than the other components of the plan.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#13</u> Yes - This stretch of road is still within the village and cars barrel along at great speed as they enter the village making it particularly dangerous. The opportunity to put in an off road foot path should be firmly grasped.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#16</u> Yes - This section of the road involves twists and turns with poor sight lines for drivers. Off-road footway very desirable.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#19</u> Yes - Whilst I support the concept here I also agree that it is lower priority than all the other proposals simply because it is more complicated to achieve, is likely to be more costly as a result, and it benefits fewer people.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#23</u> Yes - This is another really important issue and cars go down Kings Hill far too fast and many drivers say how difficult it is to keep speeds below 30 mph.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#27</u> Yes - Pedestrians here need protection too.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#28</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

Don't Know - I wouldn't personally use it, is there a need?	We are trying to establish whether there is a need through this consultation.
<u>Form#31</u> Absolutely not! The topography is difficult and the carriageway is narrow with bends having limited forward visibility. No scheme at present is supported by HCC and it is very doubtful if pedestrian demand could justify such a provision.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. Note that HCC has said it won't support an on-road footway; it has not commented on a possible off-road footway which does sit on the existing carriageway.
<u>Form#34</u> No - The proposals are unnecessary, would be a waste of precious resources and would result in ecological damage and loss of wild life habitat and bio-diversity.	<u>Council Response</u> We will decide upon the need for this footway based upon the responses to this consultation. We would contend that the loss of habitat etc caused by a 1.5m wide roadside footway at this woodland location would be relatively very small. Depending on the land available, there may even be scope for some replanting of vegetation.
<u>Form#35</u> Yes - The upper section is winding and dark/shaded so drivers have difficulty seeing pedestrians. Banks are too steep to get off road when cars approach.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#36</u> Yes - I am aware of a number of near misses walking down from the Abbey.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#40</u> Yes - This is a particularly dangerous area for walking/cycling so any separation from traffic must be welcome.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#41</u> Yes - This is a very dangerous stretch of the road even in a car! As a pedestrian it is a real challenge to not feel threatened.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#43</u> NO - Very few people use this section of road for walking and it would be expensive to create and maintain.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. Maintenance costs would be taken into account before any decision is made.
<u>Form#45</u> Yes - I'd say this is very important as the road is steep, bendy and narrow at this point.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#47</u> Yes - Any well constructed, (and ideally lit) off-road pathways would make moving around Beech safer and more enjoyable.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#48</u> Yes – Safety.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#53</u> Yes – Every little helps.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#54</u> No – Too much urbanisation. The residents of Kings Hill lobbied hard to remain as countryside when during the Neighbourhood Planning process they were requested to become a classified settlement area. If you live in the countryside you simply accept there will be roads with pavements.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#55</u> Yes – Although, if it were <u>on-road</u> , would it have the added benefit of slowing down traffic? Continuation to the Abbey, or even to the junction with Wivelrod Road, offers villagers a relatively safe 4 mile circular walking loop. Think of the health benefits.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. HCC has vetoed an on-road footway in the top section of Kings Hill, so that section (including any onward continuation along Abbey Road), which is likely to be the most lightly used, has been deferred for now.
<u>Form#59</u> Yes - I live at the top end of Kings Hill and would wish the road safety proposals to incorporate the safety for residents walking at the top end of Kings Hill as a priority within this consultation as traffic (both vehicles and cyclists) travel extremely fast coming around the bends (not seeing pedestrians and finding it harder to	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. As the project is likely to be implemented in stages we propose to prioritise the village centre and then work west up the hill, in line with decreasing pedestrian demand. HCC will not support an on-road footway in this section but we can, if there is sufficient demand, raise an off-road footway with them.



slow down as they are on a steep hill) or accelerating up Kings Hill. The road also narrows by the tree which is another danger point for pedestrians.	
<u>Form#61</u> No - There should be a single consistent on-road footpath through the village as changes in footpath position is confusing for drivers.	<u>Council Response</u> HCC has said it won't support an on-road footway in this section of road.
<u>Form#63</u> NO - The pedestrian scheme needs to be consistent throughout the village. Any off-road provision should not detract from pedestrians right to use the road as safely as possible. The on-road footpath should be provided throughout the village and should be respected by all road users.	<u>Council Response</u> HCC has said it won't support an on-road footway in this section of road.
<u>Form#64</u> Yes - Blind spots, vehicles either not slowed down after the 40MPH limit or speeding up in anticipation of same.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#65</u> Yes - We walk a lot, and would quite like to walk up to Medstead. This is the most direct route I believe, rather than going via Wivelrod, but even though we regularly walk up Medstead Road we aren't brave enough to attempt going up past the Abbey as it's narrow, bendy and dark and I have never seen anyone else walk it when I have driven that way. I am in favour of all the measures in the hope that it gets more people walking in Beech (it really annoys me that people drive to the village hall though I can see why if they are scared or too infirm to walk far) and that maybe drivers start noticing more people around and actually moderate their own driving accordingly.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#67</u> Yes - Eventually a path through the whole village would be great. My only concern is that this section is already narrow with bends. The path would be needed to show up to protect pedestrians – especially in poor light.	<u>Council Response</u> HCC has said it won't support an on-road footway in this section of road, so any footway here is likely to be off-road (i.e. separating pedestrians from traffic).
<u>Form#70</u> Yes - I feel that this should not be deferred as it is one of the most dangerous sections of our village when on foot.	<u>Council Response</u> If there is sufficient support for a footway in this section it will be reinstated in the project, but it will be the lowest priority section according to our stated prioritisation of starting in the village centre and working west up the hill.
<u>Form#71</u> Yes - This is currently the most dangerous road area for non-vehicle users and should be the first priority, not the last.	<u>Council Response</u> All sections of the road have their own dangers. We have chosen to prioritise the sections by the number of people likely to benefit. In general, most people leave their houses to walk down the hill (to the village facilities or Alton). So the assumption is that foot traffic will be heaviest in the village centre and progressively lighter as one moves up the hill to the west.
<u>Form#74</u> No - This area is too steep and narrow for people/animals to walk safely.	<u>Council Response</u> Along the north side of the road there appears to be sufficient width of HCC land for an adequate width pathway to be cleared. It would be elevated above the road for much of its length, but would be no steeper than the road. If this were to be pursued in the future then the safety aspects would need to be worked through carefully with HCC.
<u>Form#77</u> Yes - This will improve safety for pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#81</u> Yes - I wish to see a path leading to the Abbey, which takes in the whole of the village.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#83</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

No - Don't think we would use a footpath in this location. In addition, this section of road is narrow, twisty and fast and therefore dangerous.	Noted.
<u>Form#84</u> Yes, but we would like to understand why this has been removed from the current proposal.	<u>Council Response</u> The scheme submitted to HCC for initial safety audit included an on-road footway in this section. In their safety audit, HCC advised that it won't support an on-road footway here. If there is sufficient support for an off-road footway in this section it will be reinstated in the project,
<u>Form#88</u> Yes – A new off-road footway would be a lot safer on that hill and would provide a safe access to the public walkway.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#92</u> Yes - This area is terrifying as a pedestrian – the visibility is extremely poor and the speed levels are excessive. I would support this area being progressed in advance of any community speed cameras .	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The cost of a Community SpeedWatch camera would be trivial compared with the cost of constructing a section of footway, so one would not hold up the other.
<u>Form#95</u> NO - Cannot see how any off-road solution in this section would be either practically or financially feasible. Why are you proposing an off-road footpath in Section G which goes beyond the boundary of Beech village?	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. If an investigation proved that this section would not be practically or financially feasible it would not be pursued. The south side of the road in Section G is within Beech parish. Section G (Abbey Road) would not be considered unless a footway on upper Kings Hill were to be constructed.
<u>Form#96</u> Yes - Of course. Many people walk on this section and because of the sharp and blind bends and narrow sections it is probably the most hazardous section on the entire length of the road through Beech.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#98</u> Difficult to know if the south or north side from 1 Kings Hill is best for footway. I dodge from one side to the other as you just can't see what is coming round the corner at different points. You have to have very good hearing and listen hard for engines and of course that doesn't help for racing bikes.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. On first inspection, in this section it appears that there is more HCC-owned land to play with on the north side of the road rather than the south.
<u>Form#100</u> Don't Know – This part of the road is very hazardous for equestrian use, so it must also be for cyclists.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#103</u> No – [We feel trying to encourage people to use the road to walk is dangerous and the cost of implementing and maintaining these paths too high.]	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#104</u> No - The new footway should continue on-road all the way up Medstead Road/Kings Hill as this offers continuity re: narrowing the road thereby reducing the speed of traffic. In hours of darkness an on-road footway provides a safer, more exposed walking route for pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> The scheme submitted to HCC for initial safety audit included an on-road footway in this section. In their safety audit, HCC advised that it won't support an on-road footway here.
<u>Form#105</u> Yes - This would complete a path up to the Abbey which benefits those residents. It should be possible to extend this facility within the wooded verge along to Wivelrod Road which in turn would benefit walkers using Wivelrod Road for longer distance walks. If Medstead PC were amenable to continuing a footpath to Jennie Green Lane, this too would be much welcomed by walkers using Jennie Green Lane and accessing the woods opposite.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#108</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

Don't Know - We don't use it and have no strong feelings either way.	Noted.
<u>Form#110</u> Yes – Safety throughout full length of road must be a priority.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.

**Q.11A The existing footpath in the private woodland, running parallel to upper Medstead Road, has a natural surface. In your opinion, should this surface be improved to make it suitable all year round?**

Total responses: - YES 60 (55%) NO 23 (21%) Don't Know 27 (25%)  
 Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 8 (62%) NO 4 (31%) Don't Know 1 (8%)  
 Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 17 (61%) NO 2 (7%) Don't Know 9 (32%)  
 Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 10 (67%) NO 1 (7%) Don't Know 4 (27%)  
 Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 5 (63%) NO 2 (25%) Don't Know 1 (13%)  
 Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 1 (33%) NO 0 (0%) Don't Know 2 (67%)  
 Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 2 (29%) NO 4 (57%) Don't Know 1 (14%)  
 Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 11 (41%) NO 9 (33%) Don't Know 7 (26%)  
 Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 6 (67%) NO 1 (11%) Don't Know 2 (22%)

**Q.11B Is there a particular reason for your answer?**

<u>Form#2</u> Yes - Sensible but not a priority.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#3</u> No – It would spoil the existing woodland.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, but any improvement would aim not to spoil the woodland.
<u>Form #4</u> Don't Know - I reserve judgement until after this coming winter.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#9</u> No - Not unless there is evidence that there is sufficient use of the existing unmade-up path demonstrates there is a need to upgrade to a made up surface with the costs that that would incur.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed, although evidence that the current un-engineered surface is unsafe or off-putting might also be a reason for an upgrade.
<u>Form#10</u> Don't know - Unsure how much it is being actually used. And if it is worth it.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#12</u> Yes - This footpath is beneficial and I have used it several times. However, it is likely to become muddy in the winter so it would be better if the surface was improved. There are also a couple of trip hazards (small roots) which could be removed to make the path safer.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#13</u> Yes - If it's not improved folk won't use it. Scrapings [scalpings?] should be enough.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. But the minimum work may be some levelling of the surface and then scalpings on top.
<u>Form#14</u> Yes - Think that the increased foot traffic would damage the path and make it so muddy people may choice to avoid it and defeating its purpose. Some compacted gravel / hardcore or concrete egg crate sound be enough.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. But the minimum work may be some levelling of the surface and then surface material on top.
<u>Form#15</u> Yes – to avoid slipping and falling and injury.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#16</u> Don't know – I have not viewed the area – sorry!	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#18</u> Yes – Once cleared it needs to be maintained, but if a better surface is put down for all year use would be better.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#19</u> Yes - If the aim is to improve connectivity throughout the village then having a section that requires users to wear walking boots for at least half the year diminishes that benefit.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#21</u> Yes – Encourage regular use.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#23</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

Yes - It could do with minor improvement as it can be muddy in wet conditions and pedestrians will be tempted to walk on the road.	Noted.
<u>Form#26</u> Yes - Make sure its sufficiently paved/finished for winter use so shoes don't get wrecked and buggys/wheelchairs can use it otherwise it's no good for winter use.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#27</u> Yes - To make it accessible for pushchairs and wheelchairs.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#28</u> Yes - The path that has been made recently is not properly surfaced and is screened off by foliage from the street lights, so is not usable right now outside the hours of daylight or in smart shoes. When I am dog walking I go further into the woods where the dog can come off the lead, and also I am avoiding the disputed access on to Medstead Road opposite #188 [redacted]. This will have to be resolved. Unless properly surfaced AND LIT it's no better than the path that is already there higher up.	<u>Council Response</u> We contend that the newly made path is better than the ones already 'higher up' in the woods, being a more direct and therefore quicker route. Lighting the path will be a challenge (and may be expensive for the parish council to install and run), and it may be that it remains a less attractive route at night unless and until a future project tackles it. Configuring the transition from this path down to a roadside footway, opposite #188, in a sensitive manner will be a priority.
<u>Form#31</u> No - Some modest improvement might be appropriate to make it less muddy in winter – e.g. crushed hoggin or similar. But this is not intended to detract from the excellent work carried out by those who created this footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#34</u> No - Any proposal to change the surface is unnecessary, would be a waste of precious resources and would result in ecological damage and loss of wild life habitat and bio-diversity.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. We would contend that the ecological damage caused to an already hard packed bare earth surface would be minimal.
<u>Form#35</u> Yes – If muddy or overgrown pedestrians will revert to the road in bad weather.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#39</u> Yes - But only in sympathy with the woodland, i.e. not bitmap.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#40</u> No - The current surface suits all pedestrians including horses and should be inexpensive to maintain.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, although there is no evidence that horses use this footpath, and the attitude of the landowner to horse use is unknown.
<u>Form#41</u> Yes - We have much rain that makes the path muddy and slippery.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#44</u> Yes – Natural surfaces can become very boggy after heavy rainfall – and there will be more of this. This could make them too difficult for older residents to use.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#45</u> Yes - Keep it natural but something so that it's not claggy mud in the winter.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#47</u> Yes - A safer, smoother, all weather surface would be a great incentive to use the path more. Could it be lit at night? Plus this is very uneven at its lower end making it pretty unsuitable for more elderly or less agile residents.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. Lighting the path will be a challenge (and may be expensive for the parish council to install and run), and it may be that it remains a less attractive route at night unless and until a future project tackles it.
<u>Form#48</u> I don't know the area well enough to comment.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#50</u> I think there needs to be a continual on-road pavement. The woodland path is a nice addition.	<u>Council Response</u> The current approach is to move pedestrians off-road where the road appears to be less built-up and therefore traffic tends to go faster. The woodland footpath is a relatively cheap way of doing this, even if it needs to be improved.
<u>Form#51</u>	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.

Yes - An essential idea. Really important to encourage exercise from a health perspective. Important to lessen rise of cars/pollution.	
<u>Form#52</u> Unable to comment as don't know how it will be in winter.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#53</u> Don't Know - Ideally, in a perfect world with no cost constraints, you would want to improve all footpaths to make them comfortable for use all year round. However, if money is tight, this would be a lesser priority.	<u>Council Response</u> This footpath is potentially a key link between Kings Hill and the rest of the village. So the priority of making it fully usable is probably as high as the footway solution on Kings Hill itself.
<u>Form#54</u> Given the amount of use of the path for walking to and from the village centre and resulting change in character of the woodland the cost to make the path hard surfaced is just not justified.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#55</u> Don't Know – There is a tree root issue – tripping hazard. Pro improvement: Mud on shoes may deter walkers when it's very wet. Con improvement: An improved surface would soon be caked by leaves, i.e. a waste of effort.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. All of your points will be considered when making a decision.
<u>Form#53</u> Yes - Better accessibility for all pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#59</u> Yes - Would prefer more visibility of road for personal safety reasons with some of the trees being thinned out when in leaf during the summer or some sort of lighting for when walking when it is dark (if attending a function at the village hall) as the natural surface could also be a trip hazard in the dark.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The screening between the footpath and the road here is valued by the residents opposite because the path is elevated and they have privacy concerns. Lighting the path will be a challenge (and may be expensive for the parish council to install and run), and it may be that it remains a less attractive route at night unless and until a future project tackles it.
<u>Form#60</u> The current owner of the footpath has encouraged the use of motorised vehicles on the path to keep the vegetation down. This would beg the question " is this actually a footpath" ? Given the litigious nature of society currently I would think there a questions regarding third party liability. There would also need to be signage reflecting the fact that the walker is moving from an "official footpath" to a private one and vice versa.	<u>Council Response</u> If and when the incorporation of this footpath into a longer route becomes a reality we will be in a position to engage with the owner of the private woodland footpath on this matter.
<u>Form#61</u> No - No need to urbanise a woodland walk.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#62</u> Yes - As long as the surface can still be fairly natural in appearance and well maintained, I think an improved service is much more likely to encourage footpath use overall. The nature of the village, with lots of trees, leaves, debris and mud, does put people off when walking off road.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#63</u> NO - No need to urbanise a woodland walk. Keep woodland as woodland. The 'existing footpath' is a courtesy provided by the owner as stated on his notice. It can be withdrawn at any time and is closed for one day per year. It is entirely unsuitable as an alternative to a village on-road footpath provided by the council. It is a leisure amenity and to see it as part of a road safety scheme is simply a distraction and does nothing to deter drivers from behaving unreasonably.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. But residents of Kings Hill already use the footpath as a safer alternative to more hazardous walking along that stretch of road, for foot journeys to the rest of the village – so it is not solely a 'leisure path', it is already contributing to safer walking in its own right, irrespective of whether the rest of the scheme is implemented. If and when the incorporation of this footpath into a longer route becomes a reality we will be in a position to engage with the owner of the private woodland footpath on the matters of ownership, responsibility for upkeep etc.
<u>Form#64</u>	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.

No - It is relatively flat and users would be wearing suitable footwear for the surfaces at either end of the path. Would rather see the scarce budget used on constructing the proposed priorities.	
<u>Form#65</u> Don't Know - If it's obviously woodland then people would probably wear the correct footwear for woodland walking. However I suppose this might be inconvenient.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#67</u> No – The natural surface maintains the 'woodland walk'.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#70</u> Definitely not as it is perfect all year round. This would lead to further suburbanisation (which we have already seen recently) and detract from the amenity value afforded by the woodland.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, although the path will not have been in place until April 2022 and so will not have suffered winter weather yet.
<u>Form#71</u> No - No need for the expense. If any area of the footpath becomes unpassable due to mud, just add stone chippings to that area.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#73</u> No - It is in a woodland so should stay natural.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#74</u> No - The cost would be significant. Most people who wish to walk in woodland areas normally wear appropriate footwear to cope with the terrain throughout the year.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#75</u> Yes - From experience the woodland paths can become very muddy after prolonged rain and over winter, which is likely to deter all but the usual walkers and dog walkers and therefore not achieve the desired effect.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#76</u> No - I don't think this is necessary.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#77</u> Yes - If it is improved then more people will use it all year.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#78</u> No - [Poor in] cost/benefit [terms]. The current natural surface is perfectly adequate for the footfall.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#83</u> No - As far as we are aware the new footpath created in the privately owned piece of woodland is a "permissive footpath". The current (or a future landowner) could revoke access over this piece of land at any point. No money should be spent on this section of footpath unless it is legally made a permanent right of way.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed on the need for permanent access rights before any parish council expenditure.
<u>Form#84</u> Yes - This must be a well maintained, robust all weather surface otherwise it will be unusable for large parts of the year.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The path has remained usable since its clearance in April, so it will be instructive to see how it fares over the next 6 months.
<u>Form#85</u> No – It's a woodland and should not be urbanised.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#88</u> Don't know – The pathway is only accessible by going over stiles currently. Due to this I would imagine only individuals that are dressed for the weather would use the path.	<u>Council Response</u> There are no stiles on the footpath in question. You must be thinking of a different path.
<u>Form#90</u> Ideally yes but assume we are currently operating with the goodwill of the land owner; wouldn't want to jeopardise that in any way.	<u>Council Response</u> Any improvements would need to be done with the blessing of the landowner.
<u>Form#91</u> No - It may detract from the natural surroundings. Would it be acceptable to the owner?	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. Any improvements would need to be done with the blessing of the landowner.
<u>Form#92</u> Don't Know - I don't know what options are being proposed or any costings. Again, the preference would be to consider all footways e.g	<u>Council Response</u> No options are being proposed yet, we are waiting to see how the footpath fares over the winter months. Any improvement would be undertaken in the

<p>72 Kings Hill to Alton Abbey in preference to monies spent improving natural surfaces.</p>	<p>context of it needing to be an important all-weather link between Kings Hill and the lower parts of Medstead Road.</p>
<p><u>Form#95</u>  NO - This path has already been used for vehicular access and by quad bikes in contravention of current planning enforcement instructions – a permanent surface would encourage and allow further misuse of this path, particularly as it is already wider than is required for a pedestrian footpath. Has any consideration been given to the cost, and maintenance of any improved surface and, if so, will these costs be borne by the Landowner? An important question has been omitted from this survey regarding this section of off road footpath: “Do you support the provision of the off-road footway in the private woodland between 188 Medstead Road and 1 Kings Hill?” Affected residents were not consulted prior to the footpath’s creation and therefore we formally request a meeting to discuss the following issues: This footpath relies wholly on the continued permission of the landowner. What contingency is in place if the landowner withdraws his permission or the land is sold? Has this risk been adequately assessed? Is there a conflict of interest as the landowner has made no secret of his intention to have a house in woodlands? Anyone using the off-road path will still have to use the road in order to access/egress any of the properties along this stretch of path. Equally, egress at 1 Kings Hill is on a blind bend, so a continuous on-road solution would avoid this danger. An on-road solution would also stop any risk of travellers accessing the woodland at potentially two or more points. Also, during the winter months, what happens when the off-road path, ie woodland path, is too dark for safe use? Pedestrians will then be forced back on to the road making a mockery of the off-road footpath.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>  Noted about the surface. If and when the incorporation of this footpath into a longer route becomes a reality we will be in a position to engage with the owner of the private woodland footpath on the matters of ownership, responsibility for upkeep etc. There would need to be permanent access rights before any parish council expenditure. Otherwise, if permission for use of the woodland footpath were to be withdrawn, we would simply work to have the decision reversed. The key risk mitigation approach here is for the parish council to be utterly transparent and impartial in its dealings with the landowner. There is no prospect of the path being used as a bargaining chip by the landowner to promote other private interests; that would be firmly against the council’s code of conduct. If these points are understood then there is little incentive for the landowner to ‘punish the village’ by withdrawing access.  The very high bank along most of this section means that intermediate direct access up onto the path is impractical. No.194 Medstead Road, and Nos.2 &amp; 2A Kings Hill have about a 20m walk along the road to access the end of the path, which is not excessive. We will be guided by HCC advice on design and road safety, around the blind bend at Kings Hill, at the detailed design stage. Others have expressed concern about the safety of an on-road footway around the bend, and it was always expected that the transition here from off-road to on-road footpath would need careful consideration.  We don’t expect the access points to the woodland footpath to change materially from their current state, under any circumstances, certainly not to the extent that easier access is provided for traveller vehicles and caravans.  Lighting the woodland path will be a challenge (and may be expensive for the parish council to install and run), and it may be that it remains a less attractive route at night unless and until a future project tackles it. Meanwhile night users may use a torch for their safety on the path – much as night walkers in the road tend to do now. In general we would expect the use of all the footways in darkness to be a fraction of their use in daylight.</p>
<p><u>Form#96</u>  Yes - Well in winter and Spring it will certainly become difficult and hazardous to traverse.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>  Noted. It will be instructive to see how the path fares over the next 6 months.</p>
<p><u>Form#97</u>  No - Because it is woodland.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>  Noted.</p>
<p><u>Form#98</u>  Don’t Know - It could be but it does work as it is if you don’t have high heels on!!</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>  Noted.</p>
<p><u>Form#103</u>  We would prefer it was not present.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u>  The decision to clear the footpath was made by the owner of the private woodland, not the parish</p>

As one of the most effected residence of the already installed footpath on stretch of private land we are appalled that we were not properly informed of consulted by the Parish, especially as it is very clear to see the loss of privacy we would suffer as a result of this path being installed. <i>[Redacted for privacy]</i> We have over the last couple of months suffered from two incidents of verbal abuse, one of a sexual nature by path users – We require a meeting to discuss how you will reinstate our privacy and stop the noise pollution this path has created.	council. He required no permissions to do this, nor was he obliged to consult anyone before doing so. It is true, however, that individual councillors supported the clearing of the path, as it had been identified as a walking route by the Road Safety Working Group. It is very unfortunate that, despite the retained vegetation screen alongside the path, you consider your privacy has been reduced. Any verbal abuse is deplorable. The prevention of excessive noise, from any source, is a matter that you may wish to take up with EHDC, who have the necessary powers of enforcement.
<u>Form#104</u> Yes – To encourage pedestrian to use the footway all year round, thereby improving pedestrian safety.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#105</u> Yes - This is likely to be necessary if it is to be useable in inclement weather. Perhaps more attention at detail design stage of rainfall runoff routes within the woodland. The surface shouldn't be bitmac, a scalplings or gravelled surface would be more appropriate.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The path has remained usable since its clearance in April, so it will be instructive to see how it fares over the next 6 months.
<u>Form#107</u> Yes - This has been constructed without previous discussion with affected villagers and would suggest that this whole scheme is going ahead regardless.	<u>Council Response</u> The decision to clear the footpath was made by the owner of the private woodland, not the parish council. He required no permissions to do this, nor was he obliged to consult anyone before doing so. It is true, however, that individual councillors supported the clearing of the path, as it had been identified as a walking route by the Road Safety Working Group. Whether or not the whole scheme goes ahead will depend very much on the responses to this consultation.
<u>Form#108</u> Yes - This path needs to be accessible all year round.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.

**Q.12 Do you have any comments on the existing off-road footpath running from 27 Medstead Road to the A339?**

<u>Form#4</u> The overhanging branches and vegetation need to be cut back periodically by whoever is responsible for keeping it under control. If the proposed new off-road footways are constructed to a higher surface specification than this existing footpath, then an upgrade should be considered.	<u>Council Response</u> Cutting back should be done over the next 3-4 months. Agreed that a surface upgrade should be considered if new footways are to be of a higher standard.
<u>Form#12</u> It's very useful.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#13</u> It's been a huge success and should be maintained.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#15</u> Horses should not be allowed on it.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, but that would be very difficult to police.
<u>Form#19</u> This path is an excellent amenity and using it is a pleasurable experience as one is completely separated from vehicles whose drivers may or may not treat pedestrian safety seriously. At this time of year the nettles have become rather invasive but I'd rather risk a nettle sting than fear being hit by lumps of metal travelling at 30+ mph.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The nettles grow fast and need regular clearing. It is open to any volunteer to strim the path sides periodically.
<u>Form#21</u> Needs more regular maintenance. Cutting and clearing. I would like side access points for numbers 20 and 24.	<u>Council Response</u> We will review the paid-for annual maintenance programme. It is open to any volunteer to strim the path sides periodically. HCC will be trimming back trees and hedges over the next 3-4 months. Noted about the access points for individual



	properties, but that is a lower priority at the moment.
<u>Form#23</u> It's been a huge success and should be maintained.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#25</u> Maintenance of the footway at the lower end of the village (from the A339 to 27 Medstead Road) needs to be done regularly in order for it to remain usable for all pedestrians – eg pushchairs, elderly, disabled. There also needs to be clear signage as quite often I see people walking down the road rather than on the footway.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed on the maintenance. Later this year HCC will be cutting back the overgrown hedges and trees alongside the path, which should make it (a) more visible to pedestrians, and (b) more inviting to use.
<u>Form#26</u> Needs to be a suitable all year surface too.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#27</u> The surface should be improved as above to make sure it is accessible year round for pushchairs and wheelchairs.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#31</u> No, other than possible mud in winter but I'm not familiar with this section of footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#34</u> Any proposal to change the status quo would be a waste of precious resources and would result in ecological damage and loss of wild life habitat and bio-diversity.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. We would contend that the ecological damage caused by re-configuring an existing footpath would be minimal.
<u>Form#35</u> This is used very regularly by us and highly valued. However the gravel surface needs supplementing more regularly and vegetation cut back in growing season not in winter when it has died back anyway. I have personally done this on 3 occasions. Horse manure is a problem on the path, 'muddying' the surface quickly, discouraging pedestrian use.	<u>Council Response</u> We will review the paid-for annual maintenance programme. It is open to any volunteer to trim the path sides periodically. The path's use by horses seems unavoidable; perhaps rider education is the best option here.
<u>Form#39</u> It's excellent.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#40</u> The current surface suits all pedestrians including horses and should be inexpensive to maintain, ideal for a rural environment.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#47</u> This gets very muddy in wet weather; an all-weather surface would be useful. Additionally, it needs much better signage. I often see walkers/runners using the road rather than the footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted about the surface. Later this year HCC will be cutting back the overgrown hedges and trees alongside the path, which should make it (a) more visible to pedestrians, and (b) more inviting to use.
<u>Form#48</u> Yes – encourage more people to use it! It is positively dangerous to walk on the road when the footpath exists.	<u>Council Response</u> The parish council could promote this message through Beech News, for example.
<u>Form#49</u> There should be a way onto and off the footpath at the foot of Snode Hill.	<u>Council Response</u> Pedestrians can use the entrance to Wyards Farm cottages, almost directly opposite Snode Hill, to access the footpath.
<u>Form#53</u> I am very happy with the existing footway and have used it many times.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#54</u> This path is heavily used it needs to be better maintained. The area between the path and the road needs to be kept cleared of bushes and trees to improve safety of pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. We will review the annual paid-for maintenance programme. HCC will be cutting out dead hawthorn and diseased ash trees this autumn/winter, which should improve the visibility.
<u>Form#55</u> It would benefit from more frequent foliage cutting back – this is tick territory! Is it also a bridleway? Horses use it too. If so, could it be made a bit wider to allow people to pass horses?	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. We will review the annual paid-for maintenance programme. It is not a bridleway but we must accept that horse riders use it. If we decide to upgrade the pathway surface we may consider widening it a little too.
<u>Form#60</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

Vegetation should be removed between the path and the road to allow pedestrians to be visible.	HCC will be cutting out dead hawthorn and diseased ash trees this autumn/winter, which should improve the visibility.
<u>Form#61</u> No changes are needed as this is a rural footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#62</u> The footpath works well when it is cut back and maintained.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#64</u> It can be unpleasant and the comment above [users would be wearing suitable footwear for the surfaces at either end of the path] does not apply as the access at either end are hard surfaces. Would welcome hard, all weather surfaces here.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#65</u> It's great, we walk to Alton a lot using it. Only drawback is I occasionally get stung by nettles if I don't keep my hands in my pockets.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. We will review the annual paid-for maintenance programme.
<u>Form#66</u> There needs to be a proper crossing on the A339.	<u>Council Response</u> This is something that we can consider adding to any upgrade of the footpath.
<u>Form#67</u> Needs maintenance – difficult to walk with pram/pushchair sometimes and horse droppings not conducive for evening/night use!	<u>Council Response</u> We will review the paid-for annual maintenance programme. Its use by horses seems unavoidable; perhaps rider education is the best option here.
<u>Form#69</u> Needs an improved surface. Rather dark in winter. Wet in the winter with the leaf fall. Punctures bicycle tyres when blackthorn hedge cut.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted about the path surface. The rest we can do little about.
<u>Form#70</u> Please do not further manicure or suburbanise.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The parish council is responsible for the upkeep only of the path itself (and keeping green vegetation clear of it). The rest of the land is the responsibility of HCC, but the closely cropped grass area is cut by the residents whose drive bisects it.
<u>Form#81</u> Any paths should ideally be capable of being walked along at all times of the year.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#91</u> [No comments], as long as it is adequately maintained.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed. We will review the paid-for annual maintenance programme.
<u>Form#95</u> This off-road footpath is not particularly safe for the more vulnerable pedestrians as they cannot be seen easily from the road. Additionally, there is no night time lighting. It is less controversial because it does not require destruction of woodland, it is pre-existing so the width of the road is not changing, as you are proposing on Section D.	<u>Council Response</u> HCC will be cutting out dead hawthorn and diseased ash trees this autumn/winter, which should improve the visibility. There has been no demand for additional lighting of this path, over and above any partial illumination from the street lamps.
<u>Form#97</u> It is always a relief to get there! It could be kept cleaner, by the local authority.	<u>Council Response</u> It is the parish council's responsibility to maintain the path. But we rely on the elements to wash it and keep it clear of debris (other than horse droppings, which riders should ideally deal with).
<u>Form#98</u> Rarely use this bit but know people who do an I personally think this bit is excellent.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#100</u> The path needs a better surface. A resident has always cut the grass; if he moved it would need a lot more maintenance.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed that a surface upgrade should be considered if new footways are to be of a higher standard. The parish council is responsible for the upkeep only of the path itself (and keeping green vegetation clear of it). The rest of the land, like other roadside verges on land that they own, is the

	responsibility of HCC. If that resident were to stop mowing the grass then HCC would need to manage it.
<u>Form#104</u> Can be overgrown and dark at certain times of the year.	<u>Council Response</u> We will review the paid-for annual maintenance programme on cutting back vegetation. There has been no demand for additional lighting of this path, over and above any partial illumination from the street lamps.
<u>Form#105</u> This functions well. More frequent trimming of vegetation would be good.	<u>Council Response</u> We will review the paid-for annual maintenance programme on cutting back vegetation.
<u>Form#108</u> The path is overgrown on the left side in the direction of the A339. I would suggest that the trees be cut back to head height from 27 Medstead down to Wyards Valley. This would allow more natural light on the path and help it free the leaves and less wet underfoot. The path maintenance needs to be more regular. The path from Wyards Valley to A339 is narrow and the path itself is very rutted. The crossing on the A339 could do with improving as the myriad of signs prevent visibility looking up the A339 to cross into Medstead Road. This is a particular problem to me as a mobility scooter user and I understand it is less relevant to walkers.	<u>Council Response</u> HCC, who own the vegetation between the path and road, will be cutting out dead hawthorn and diseased ash trees this autumn/winter, but they will not be reducing the general height. We will review the paid-for annual maintenance programme for the path, including pathside vegetation clearance. HCC is due to undertake an audit of road signs in the coming months, and your points about signs at the junction can be raised with them.
<u>Form#110</u> Valuable walkway away from Medstead Road.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.

**Q.13A Would you support the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in the village centre (including Wellhouse Road), if it were to become permitted under HCC policy?**

Total responses: - YES 88 (80%) NO 22 (20%)  
Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 13 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 26 (93%) NO 2 (7%)  
Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 13 (87%) NO 2 (13%)  
Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 5 (63%) NO 3 (38%)  
Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 3 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 4 (57%) NO 3 (43%)  
Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 16 (59%) NO 11 (41%)  
Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 8 (89%) NO 1 (11%)

**Q.13B If 'No', please state why.**

<u>Form#1</u> Drivers who don't respect 30mph restrictions won't respect 20mph either. Those who do respect 30mph are already driving thoughtfully. Enforcement of 20mph limits is usually down to residents' speedwatch patrols which have limited operational locations and is difficult at night when the worst offenders are evident. A 20mph limit would likely be applied only to sections of the village's roads and therefore be not as effective as the blanket 30mph limit. I support the concept expressed in Q14A in respect of a 30mph limit.	<u>Council Response</u> The concern is that 30mph is too fast for the village centre, whether or not the on-road footway is installed. We would expect a 20mph to result in a significant degree of voluntary compliance, with even more compliance if the on-road footway is installed. There is no proposal to remove the 30mph limit from where it currently applies outside the village centre.
<u>Form#2</u> I don't support 20mph.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#7</u> [Yes but] Traffic speed needs to be reduced especially if the proposed new footway goes ahead.	<u>Council Response</u> The expectation is that the on-road footway, probably together with appropriate new traffic signage, will itself cause vehicles to drive more slowly and cautiously.
<u>Form#10</u> It will not be good enough to rely on a legal limit – there have to be physical enforcement measures/ave speed controls. And also the side effect of changing the sight lines	<u>Council Response</u> We would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone. Noted about the reduction to

for access onto the road, may inadvertently encourage yet more houses being built.	required sight lines for new development, but that would be unavoidable.
<u>Form#16</u> [Yes] but I have reservations regarding whether or not 20mph is realistic without additional warning signage and pinch points in the road.	<u>Council Response</u> We would agree appropriate signage with HCC as part of any 20mph scheme. If implemented alongside an on-road footway, that footway should itself act as a traffic calming measure and contribute to some speed reduction.
<u>Form#23</u> Yes - Such a good idea. Low cost and would really emphasise that this is an area heavily used by pedestrians.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#25</u> I don't think anyone observes 20mph any more than 30mph. What we need are clearer ways of enforcing the 30mph including traffic calming islands plus the signs that show the speed you are doing as it shames people into thinking about their speed.	<u>Council Response</u> We would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone. HCC's policy is not to install traffic calming islands. We may consider speed indicator devices in the future, but we are currently trialling Community SpeedWatch cameras which, if they prove practical, will entail some form of police speed enforcement.
<u>Form#31</u> Because it would not work and would not be respected. 20 MPH schemes are good in situations such as Alton town centre where traffic speeds tend to be lower anyway and are easier to introduce and enforce. The Alton scheme is backed up with speed cushions and tables etc. The 20 MPH scheme at Selborne has been abused ever since it was installed in 1995, despite various attempts by HCC over the years to help enforce it with coloured road surfaces etc. Since the existing 30 limit in Beech is not respected, why is it thought that an even lower limit would be?	<u>Council Response</u> We are primarily considering it in the village centre, where we would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone. Compliance could be enhanced by the use of an Automatic Community SpeedWatch camera, to catch very serious and persistent offenders. Occasional police enforcement could also be requested, as at present.
<u>Form#34</u> Same comment as for Q1B.	<u>Council Response</u> As for Q1B.
<u>Form#40</u> Just too slow and hard to enforce.	<u>Council Response</u> Residents in the centre of the village think that excessive speed is a major factor in making this section of the road unsafe to walk along.
<u>Form#43</u> Would be largely ignored unless enforced by the police.	<u>Council Response</u> We would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone.
<u>Form#45</u> Support but not sure it would be adhered to by the majority.	
<u>Form#47</u> No - It's tempting (and easy) to say yes, but incentivising people to drive at speeds suitable to the road conditions and time of day is more likely to be effective than a blanket limit which serves to irritate. Most, not all, of the speeding in Wellhouse is by delivery vans; without heavy-handed enforcement, a 20 mph limit is not going to change their behaviour.	<u>Council Response</u> We are primarily considering a 20mph limit in the village centre, where we would expect the on-road footway (i.e. changed road conditions) to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone. We acknowledge the problems with delivery drivers, in Wellhouse Road and elsewhere, but there should still be a voluntary speed reduction effect overall.
<u>Form#48</u> NO - I'd be in favour of an "advisory" limit. Delivery vans tend to be the fastest vehicles and can be dangerous if met at the Village Hall bend in the road. Most residents are considerate & reduce their speed in practice.	<u>Council Response</u> A 20mph limit would in effect be "advisory" as regular police enforcement is unlikely and we would be relying largely on voluntary compliance (or at least voluntary speed reduction). We acknowledge the problems with delivery drivers, in Wellhouse Road and elsewhere, but there should still be a voluntary speed reduction effect overall.
<u>Form#50</u> Not enforceable.	<u>Council Response</u> We would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect

	a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone.
<u>Form#51</u> Yes – Definitely – road humps, everything. More police enforcement.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, but HCC policy is not to introduce new road humps etc. Also, police enforcement should be much as occurs with the present 30mph limit.
<u>Form#52</u> DEFINITELY YES! Combination of speeding drivers plus poor visibility. Impact on walkers at 20mph is going to cause substantially less injury – research and evidence based.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#54</u> Yes - Page 32/ appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood plan makes a clear case that the 20mph solution for reduction of speedsters is the most favoured by the village this is especially the case in Medstead Road.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#59</u> No - The current proposals would be sufficient if implemented.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#60</u> In our opinion travelling at 30 mph is not the problem. The Medstead road is used as a cut through from the A339 to the A31 at Four Marks. How do you enforce a 20 mph limit effectively?	<u>Council Response</u> The concern is that 30mph is too fast for the village centre, whether or not the on-road footway is installed. We would expect a 20mph to result in a significant degree of voluntary compliance, with even more compliance if the on-road footway is installed. It would all act to make the route a less attractive cut-through.
<u>Form#62</u> Yes - There is absolutely no reason NOT to introduce a 20pmh speed limit. If we can make it as clear as possible to all road users that any form of excessive speed is a real danger to the residents, pedestrians and wildlife, I think we need to do everything possible to achieve this.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. Current HCC policy is not to introduce new 20mph zones, but we hope and expect that to change.
<u>Form#63</u> Categorically Yes, a slower flow of traffic through the village is key to achieving road safety. This should be a top priority notwithstanding HCC's current stance. I believe there is scope for wider action in collaboration with other villages in North Hampshire to collectively campaign for the right to control traffic flows through our own villages.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. We are engaged with the regional branch of the '20 is Plenty' organisation, which has the support of many Hampshire parish councils, and which is lobbying HCC.
<u>Form#67</u> Yes – Would like to see 20mph. But not sure enforceable as 30mph is not observed.	<u>Council Response</u> We would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone.
<u>Form#69</u> Speed signs deter from the rural feel of Wellhouse. It's not a through road so speeding isn't a problem. A small section of 20mph at the village centre is OK.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#70</u> [Yes but] only with the caveat that it be fully enforced. Whilst I have no objection at all to a lowering of the limit, I see no value in changing one unenforced limit for another. What is needed is full adherence to and respect for the speed limit. The village would be a far safer place if the existing speed limit were adhered to, if that proved otherwise, only then consider a lower limit.	<u>Council Response</u> Even with current levels of enforcement, we would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone.
<u>Form#74</u> Better to put time and resource into achieving 100% acceptance of 30 mile an hour speed limit before setting up a further scheme to fail.	<u>Council Response</u> Even with current levels of enforcement, we would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater

	reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone.
<u>Form#80</u> No – Too long a road. Better measures available such as humps.	<u>Council Response</u> We are suggesting a 20mph limit only in the village centre, not necessarily converting the entire current 30mph zone. HCC’s policy is not to install physical traffic calming measures such as road humps.
<u>Form#83</u> If the scheme goes ahead as planned, then you’ll have encroaching residents hedges and an on road footpath. If that doesn’t traffic calm enough then a 20mph is not going to help further. Can’t you get more 30mph signs erected along the whole stretch of Medstead Road and Kings Hill?	<u>Council Response</u> We would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone. The use of 30mph repeater signs in zones where there are street lights is not consistent with road traffic regulations. There used to be some in Beech but they were removed by HCC.
<u>Form#84</u> No - Any speed limit revision should apply throughout Beech although enforcement would be required to ensure compliance. Sadly those disregarding the current speed limit are likely to disregard any changes. In addition the environmental impact of vehicles travelling slower and therefore in lower gears (with higher engine revolutions) would need to be assessed	<u>Council Response</u> We do not currently propose a 20mph limit throughout the entire village. If HCC changes its policy to allow new 20mph zones, it may choose to revert to permitting them only urban areas and built-up residential areas in villages. In Beech’s case, that may point to the village centre only. But, if and when HCC’s policy changes, this is a discussion we can have with them.
<u>Form#85</u> Yes - This would be more important than a footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> The aim would be to have a 20mph speed limit in the village centre as well as an on-road footway.
<u>Form#88</u> Yes - I believe this would be safer as, with the new on-road footways, the lanes will be narrower and there are a lot of blind corners.	<u>Council Response</u> We would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone.
<u>Form#92</u> Yes - Given the proposals which in effect decrease the width of the road, the opportunity to speed would be reduced, the money would be better used to fund all of the works, and mark the road surface by Bushy Leaze Wood and on Kings Hill with 30mph paint more prominently. However would support the 20mph reduction in that area and on Kings Hill.	<u>Council Response</u> We do not currently propose a 20mph limit throughout the entire village. If HCC changes its policy to allow new 20mph zones, it may choose to revert to permitting them only in urban areas and built-up residential areas in villages. In Beech’s case, that may point to the village centre only. But, if and when HCC’s policy changes, this is a discussion we can have with them.
<u>Form#95</u> Yes - In supporting this, we have reservations regarding its practicality and enforceability given this would introduce very quick changes of speed limits from 40 to 30 to 20 and then back to 30 again within a very short distance	<u>Council Response</u> We assume that you are talking about entering the village centre from the A339. The precise position of the 20mph sign would be matter for agreement with HCC. Perhaps the transition would be direct from 40 to 20.
<u>Form#98</u> I think 30 is fine, what we need is better driver training to understand that you drive to road conditions not just to speed limits. If you see someone walking you immediately slow down, unfortunately a lot of people don’t have common sense!	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. Sadly better driver training is not something that we can rely on to happen.
<u>Form#101</u> No – Don’t think this is necessary or effective.	<u>Council Response</u> The concern is that 30mph is too fast for the village centre, whether or not the on-road footway is installed. We would expect a 20mph limit to result in a significant degree of voluntary compliance, with even more compliance if the on-road footway is installed.
<u>Form#103</u> No - There have been no reports of any serious accidents.	<u>Council Response</u> No, but there have been regular near misses. There was an accident where pedestrian was injured only 18 months ago.

<u>Form#107</u> No - Not in addition to scheme but instead of because vehicle speed is the fundamental problem.	<u>Council Response</u> Not all vehicles will keep to the 20mph speed limit, and so we believe that an on-road footway will also be of benefit.
--	--

**Q.14A Would you support the use of unmanned Community SpeedWatch cameras (speed and number plate recording) in Beech, if it were to become supported by Hampshire Constabulary?**

Total responses: - YES 87 (79%) NO 23 (21%)  
 Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 11 (85%) NO 2 (15%)  
 Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 26 (93%) NO 2 (7%)  
 Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 12 (80%) NO 3 (20%)  
 Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 5 (63%) NO 3 (38%)  
 Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 3 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
 Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 4 (57%) NO 3 (43%)  
 Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 17 (63%) NO 10 (37%)  
 Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 9 (100%) NO 0 (0%)

**Q.14B If 'No', please state why.**

<u>Form#10</u> [Yes but] Can we have an average speed system through Beech? It is the only really effective speed limiting measure other than physical bumps etc – which have problems of their own. Upkeep, noise etc. Also having number plates and times is useful for detecting crime on occasion.	<u>Council Response</u> We are trialling an average speed Community SpeedWatch camera system at the moment.
<u>Form#13</u> Yes - What a sensible idea. However the on road foot ways should be the priority if money is tight.	<u>Council Response</u> We are pursuing the camera initiative in parallel with the New Footways Project, and it may come to fruition before the footways.
<u>Form#19</u> I would rather we focus the limited resources and funds on one solution for the whole village rather than have them diluted onto this alternative which is likely only to control speed in the area that the camera is located. In other words focus on delivering the proposed solution and only then consider whether this option might enhance the position further.	<u>Council Response</u> If unmanned Community SpeedWatch cameras are supported by the police and HCC then they could be a quick and relatively cheap measure that could be introduced, to the benefit of at least part of the village. We would need to put in place a separate CSW team so as not to divert resources from the footways project.
<u>Form#23</u> Yes - This makes a lot of sense. Reduced speed massively improves the quality of life of local people.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#31</u> Because these schemes have no real 'teeth'!	<u>Council Response</u> We would not implement a SpeedWatch scheme without police commitment to an adequate level of enforcement.
<u>Form#34</u> Same comment as for Q1B, plus: The provision of speed and automatic numberplate recording (ANPR) would be an unnecessary and unjustifiable intrusion of privacy and human rights.	<u>Council Response</u> As for Q1B, plus: Community SpeedWatch systems (whether using manual or photographic recording of number plates) do not automatically identify the owner of the vehicle or driver. The use of the national vehicle database is restricted to the police and DVLA and is not available to SpeedWatch teams.
<u>Form#40</u> No, offenders will still speed in between the detection points.	<u>Council Response</u> That is a risk, but the overall deterrent effect can be maximised by careful placement of the one or two cameras. We are trialling an average speed Community SpeedWatch camera system at the moment which, if successful, may eliminate that risk. Also, the fixed cameras may be able to be periodically moved, for better effect.
<u>Form#45</u> Have no objection to slowing people down but am fed up with current levels of general surveillance, so would rather find another way.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#47</u>	<u>Council Response</u>

<p>It feels too much like ‘Big Brother’ checking up on us. Innovative and varying signage (such as that introduced already), is more likely to have a calming affect.</p>	<p>The signage is useful but can tend to be disregarded by regular road users. Community SpeedWatch, especially if consistent, should be much more effective in deterring persistent serious speedsters (of which there are several).</p>
<p><u>Form#48</u> This is a sure fire way to get residents angry, especially if fines/points were incurred.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Community SpeedWatch schemes do not result in fines/points in the same way as police speed traps. It is an educational scheme. The sanctions are chiefly confidential warning letters, which could ultimately result in more serious sanctions for persistent offenders.</p>
<p><u>Form#23</u> An ineffective scheme (waste of money).</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We arerunning a trial to establish effectiveness.</p>
<p><u>Form#60</u> Hampshire constabulary don’t have the resources, apparently, to respond effectively to serious crimes. They don’t need any more speed cameras to manage.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> What is being examined is a Community SpeedWatch scheme, in which the vast majority of the effort (and the management of the camera) is performed by the local SpeedWatch team itself.</p>
<p><u>Form#62</u> Yes - As above, any measures to slow down the majority of vehicles through the village are a good thing. We need to make it as clear as possible that speeding and careless driving has very real consequences.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted.</p>
<p><u>Form#63</u> Absolutely not. When the police advised Neighbourhood Speedwatch groups they pointed out that these usually catch village residents. I strongly believe if we wish to unite the village and promote social cohesion this should be approached through community education (village newsletter/village campaigns/appropriate signage/etc) where it becomes socially unacceptable to speed, rather than through officialdom and punishment, such as fines.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, but Community SpeedWatch schemes do not result in fines/points in the same way as police speed traps. It is an educational scheme. The sanctions are chiefly confidential warning letters, which could ultimately result in more serious sanctions for persistent offenders. But there is no reason why all of the community education initiatives that you mention should not be implemented before any SpeedWatch scheme.</p>
<p><u>Form#69</u> Too ‘nanny state’ for me. As villagers and frequent users we are the group most likely to end up with fines. Also unsightly. Spoil rural environs.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, but Community SpeedWatch schemes do not result in fines/points in the same way as police speed traps. It is an educational scheme. The sanctions are chiefly confidential warning letters, which could ultimately result in more serious sanctions for persistent offenders.</p>
<p><u>Form#60</u> Yes - I would welcome that. I have a significant concern that the footway proposals will not be safe unless and until the speed of travel by most through the village falls to the legal speed limit.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted.</p>
<p><u>Form#74</u> Money would be better spent on education to achieve acceptance of 30 mile an hour speed limit</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, but Community SpeedWatch is primarily an educational scheme. The sanctions are chiefly confidential warning letters, which could ultimately result in more serious sanctions for persistent offenders.</p>
<p><u>Form#83</u> Yes in the 30mph areas but not in any 20mph areas. We drive at 30mph (or less as appropriate) and it’s not pleasant when the driver behind you is wants to share your boot space! This would be so much worse with a 20mph area.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted.</p>
<p><u>Form#84</u> Not able to answer this. Exactly what are ‘unmanned Community SpeedWatch cameras’? Are they permanent or moveable? Are they backed up with enforcement action? Are they Average Speed cameras? Who would fund these and what is the cost? Realistically the only form of camera that is consistently effective</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Community SpeedWatch is primarily an educational scheme. The sanctions are chiefly confidential warning letters, which could ultimately result in more serious sanctions for persistent offenders. The scheme is usually implemented intermittently by roadside volunteers with a speed recording device (writing down number plates).</p>



are Average Speed cameras, for which Beech (as a ribbon development) is almost ideally suited	What is being considered is a new concept (with the same type of enforcement) of, instead, a fixed camera that records speeds and number plates, that can operate for longer periods. The position of the fixed camera can, in theory, be changed periodically. The equipment is significantly cheaper than police ANPR speed cameras. Bluntly, to the police and HCC, the accident rate in Beech doesn't merit any more action on speed limits and enforcement than is currently in place. In that respect, Beech is no different to hundreds of other rural villages in Hampshire.
<u>Form#85</u> Yes - Better than a footpath.	<u>Council Response</u> The aim would be to enforce speed limits in this way as well as having footways.
<u>Form#89</u> Not at this time as we don't believe the wider implications of using cameras has been discussed or considered, this could be very divisive.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, but this consultation is intended to gauge the level of support for using these cameras.
<u>Form#92</u> The monies would be best used to spend on progressing works to the top of Kings Hill to the Abbey rather than the speedwatch cameras.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The cost of a Community SpeedWatch camera would be trivial compared with the cost of constructing a section of footway, so one would not hold up the other.
<u>Form#95</u> Yes - We suggest that such cameras should only be used where drivers are made aware of their existence by appropriate signage to force a reduced speed rather than merely to catch people speeding.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. The Community SpeedWatch scheme is supposed to be educational in nature, and your suggestion chimes with that. Such signage would need to be agreed with HCC.
<u>Form#98</u> Again I don't think it is just about speed it's about awareness and consideration.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed, but we believe that 'educational' speed enforcement via a Community SpeedWatch scheme plays its part in raising awareness and consideration.
<u>Form#103</u> Not necessary - The police regularly use cameras in Beech.	<u>Council Response</u> The police do use speed cameras here, but only for short periods each time. Speed data shows that it is not an effective deterrent. We are looking for a more permanent, and therefore more effective, deterrent.
<u>Form#105</u> [Yes but] This would have to be approved by Police and monitored by them to catch repeat offenders. Unmonitored cameras will be ignored in the long run and thus not beneficial.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed, although the management of the system would mostly be done by the volunteer SpeedWatch team, with the police contacting selected persistent and/or severe 'offenders'.
<u>Form#107</u> No - Not in addition to scheme but instead of because vehicle speed is the fundamental problem.	<u>Council Response</u> In an ideal world you could be right. But experience shows that we would not be able to rely on police support of Community SpeedWatch in perpetuity, as their policies and resources are always subject to change.
<u>Form#108</u> Do not agree with community speedwatch.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.

**Q.15A Do you agree with the proposed prioritisation for constructing new footways (starting with village centre, then moving west up the hill)?**

Total responses: - YES 97 (88%) NO 13 (12%)  
Zone 1: Village Centre East - YES 11 (85%) NO 2 (15%)  
Zone 2: Village Centre West - YES 28 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
Zone 3: Wellhouse Rd East - YES 15 (100%) NO 0 (0%)  
Zone 4: Wellhouse Rd West - YES 7 (88%) NO 1 (13%)  
Zone 5: Bushy Leaze East - YES 2 (67%) NO 1 (33%)  
Zone 6: Bushy Leaze West - YES 5 (71%) NO 2 (29%)  
Zone 7: Kings Hill - YES 20 (74%) NO 7 (26%)

Zone 8: Parish Outliers - YES 9 (100%) NO 0 (0%)	
Q.15B If 'No', please state why.	
<u>Form#7</u> Do Kings Hill first and see how it works before doing the village centre one.	<u>Council Response</u> The need for a successful on-road footway in the village centre is greater than on Kings Hill. If funds are limited (which is highly likely) then it will be important to deploy them first at the points of greatest need. We do not see that road safety can be worsened by constructing an on-road footway in the village centre, and so we would prefer to start there.
<u>Form#13</u> Yes - This is a sensible practicable solution dealing with the most congested areas first.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#14</u> Yes - As this section has the most pinch points and blind corners it seems sensible.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#25</u> Yes - But apologies I don't know how much data we have about the most used sections by pedestrians through the village as this should determine prioritisation. Presumably people tend to walk in Beech in order to get to the centre of the village – ie village hall – rather than just to access Bushy Leaze for walking?	<u>Council Response</u> We don't have hard data but one of the objectives is to make it safer for people to walk to the village's community facilities (principally the village hall) and on into Alton. So the assumption is that foot traffic will be heaviest in the village centre and progressively lighter as one moves up the hill to the west.
<u>Form#34</u> Since I object to all of the proposals I also object to any of the works being prioritised.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#47</u> No - I don't agree with constructing on-road footways in Beech, full stop.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#48</u> Yes - I assume you mean off-road footways? No, if on road.	<u>Council Response</u> The question is about the wisdom of dealing with the village centre first and then moving westwards up the hill.
<u>Form#54</u> No to on road 'footpaths' which are not really footways. And Yes to off road footpaths.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#60</u> I selected "No" as "yes" doesn't give an option for freeform text. We have no preference for prioritisation.	<u>Council Response</u> Apologies, you could in fact have selected 'YES' and made a text comment – many have! We have recorded your answer as 'YES'.
<u>Form#61</u> Yes - If it solves the issues of traffic volume and speed.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. Although the primary aim is to enhance road safety for pedestrians in particular, we expect the effect will also be to reduce traffic speed and perhaps volume too.
<u>Form#63</u> Only if it is continuous throughout the village.	<u>Council Response</u> The sequence is intended to result in an ever expanding continuous footway.
<u>Form#70</u> The very top of Kings Hill is by far the most dangerous sections of our village when on foot. Start with the areas that represent the greatest hazard to life and limb.	<u>Council Response</u> All sections of the road have their own dangers. We have chosen to prioritise the sections by the number of people likely to benefit. In general, most people leave their houses to walk down the hill (to the village facilities or Alton). So the assumption is that foot traffic will be heaviest in the village centre and progressively lighter as one moves up the hill to the west.
<u>Form#71</u> The upper part of Kings Hill is the most dangerous for non-vehicle traffic and should be the highest priority.	
<u>Form#74</u> Please see answers above from Q1.	<u>Council Response</u> As for Q1B.
<u>Form#83</u> We would have thought that most speeding occurs away from the village centre where the	<u>Council Response</u> The project objective is to make walking through all parts of the village safer and more attractive, not to reduce traffic speed per se (which is

road is already narrow with blind bends. Those who are going to walk in the village centre probably already do so as it is easier than using their car. If you want to encourage more walking and traffic calming, better to start away from the village centre.	largely the domain of HCC and police). There are people who live in the village centre who drive 100-150m from their homes to the village hall because they feel it so unsafe to walk; that is the nature of the issue we wish to address. We have chosen to prioritise the sections by the number of people likely to benefit. In general, most people leave their houses to walk down the hill (to the village facilities or Alton). So the assumption is that foot traffic will be heaviest in the village centre and progressively lighter as one moves up the hill to the west.
<u>Form#84</u> We strongly believe that any proposals must be inclusive and benefit all residents in Beech, consequently a reasoned priority to any incremental work must be adopted that includes costs, ease of execution and a demonstration that all parts of Beech are considered equally. Our preference would be to prioritise the off-road footways to improve access to the wood which is regularly used for recreation and dog walking.	<u>Council Response</u> All sections of the road have their own dangers. We have chosen to prioritise the sections by the number of people likely to benefit. In general, most people leave their houses to walk down the hill (to the village facilities or Alton). So the assumption is that foot traffic will be heaviest in the village centre and progressively lighter as one moves up the hill to the west. Since the aim is to permit residents to walk safely through the village, every resident will have the benefit of every piece of footway infrastructure throughout the village.
<u>Form#92</u> The sections of road which have least visibility (and are the narrowest) are within the village centre and also at the top of Kings Hill (72-Abbey) The section by the wood is quite wide and pedestrians can be more easily seen by motorists. Would support "section 5" top of Kings Hill to the Abbey being done at the same time as section 1.	<u>Council Response</u> All sections of the road have their own dangers. We have chosen to prioritise the sections by the number of people likely to benefit. In general, most people leave their houses to walk down the hill (to the village facilities or Alton). So the assumption is that foot traffic will be heaviest in the village centre and progressively lighter as one moves up the hill to the west. Since the aim is to permit residents to walk safely through the village, every resident will have the benefit of every piece of footway infrastructure throughout the village.
<u>Form#95</u> Yes, Sections B and C contain the most constricted and therefore most dangerous section of roadway and, therefore, should be treated as a priority.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#100</u> Yes AND No. How long would the road be closed for? What would happen next if this did not improve traffic speeding?	<u>Council Response</u> We can't estimate at this stage how long the stages of construction would take. It may be possible to make an estimate once the detailed designs have been completed. Traffic speed reduction will be achieved principally through speed limit enforcement, and possibly a lower speed limit, rather than through putting the footways in place. Although we do expect (from precedents) that the on-road footways in the village centre and on Kings Hill will result in some limited speed reduction.
<u>Form#103</u> To encourage pedestrians to use this as an area to walk is dangerous to people and vehicles .	<u>Council Response</u> Noted. However, many residents <b>do</b> wish to walk in the village, nor unreasonably, and the purpose of the project is to facilitate them doing so in a safer manner than they can now, and without compromising the safety of other road users.
<u>Form#107</u> No - If scheme is to go ahead then only the on road pavement in the village centre should be constructed to see whether it is actually workable.	<u>Council Response</u> It is inevitable that the scheme would be built in stages. Any issues or lessons arising from the village centre on-road footway (the first stage) would be absorbed as the project progressed.

**Q.16 Do you have any other comments on the project that you have not supplied elsewhere?**

<u>Form#7</u> Selborne managed eventually to overcome HCC objections, it took a long time and a lot of effort though.	<u>Council Response</u> We are attempting to work with HCC, rather than against them, on road infrastructure design, and to influence policy on 20mph speed limits and Community Speedwatch.
<u>Form#8</u> I understand your comment on Wellhouse Road, but it falls short of the truth. There are more than the occasional speeding car and the road is used much more than the main road by walkers. Therefore	<u>Council Response</u> We acknowledge that some cars speed on Wellhouse Road. But we would contend that if there are more walkers on Wellhouse Road (than on Medstead Road)

<p>the fact there is much more foot traffic on Wellhouse Road means that this should have been included in your plan, perhaps with advisory 20mph speed limit signs rather than statutory ones. One further comment is that a strong marketing campaign is needed for Beech residents themselves to slow down. Nevertheless I support your current plans whole-heartedly. Good luck with their implementation.</p>	<p>it is precisely because there are fewer vehicles, whether speeding or not. A 20mph zone in the village centre will inevitably include Wellhouse Road. We could consider unofficial '20 is plenty' or similar signs for Wellhouse Road in the meantime, as part of some sort of publicity drive to reduce vehicle speeds of Wellhouse Road residents and their visitors.</p>
<p><u>Form#10</u> It will be an excellent outcome to give the village back its foot communication way as a place to chat, and have chance meetings without being forced to one side by impatient drivers. This is the stuff of community which has been stolen by the road traffic.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#12</u> I strongly support this overall plan to address the long-running road safety issue in Beech. We are all being encouraged to leave our cars at home and walk and cycle whenever possible, for both environmental and health reasons, and yet in Beech we have to put ourselves at risk whenever we do so, especially in the winter and after dark. I hope the funding and necessary approvals can be found quickly to make this happen. I recognise that this work will have to be done in stages, and I think it makes good sense to start in the village centre, where the maximum number of people will benefit.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#13</u> The Beech Road Safety Group should be congratulated on all the work they have done so far including the excellent consultation document and this survey. They have put in an enormous amount of thought and care and I hope HCC will support its execution.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#14</u> Think these are some great proposals and hope they go through. In the last few months I have begun to walk my new born son to the woods quite often. In this time I have had over 10 near misses, 2 people stop and shout at me though their car window after I asked them to slow down. I have even had two people stop, get out car and threaten me with violence so something has to be done ASAP.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#18</u> I fully back the new footpaths for pedestrian safety in the village and am aware of all the lengthy time and consultation that goes into these matters to get them agreed. But I have strong concerns of the 10 bollards that have been erected recently overnight (apparently by HCC) without any consultation with neighbouring property owners, land owners and local villagers, or any research into how these 10 bollards would affect pedestrians behaviour exiting the corner of Kings Hill. As you will know the upper woodland road safety group pathway comes out here and unfortunately I witnessed a pedestrian who was clearly confused by the bollards walk right into the road on the bend as a car came round the corner. This could have caused a fatality. I also know there are a few teenagers and children who walk these paths on their own and to them the 10 bollards may look like a barrier and an end to the path, so there is some confusion here. This incident was reported to HCC as a near miss but I did not hear anything back. I hope it will be taken seriously and other people coming across these unsightly large bollards will not get confused and do the same thing. [Redacted] regularly tend to see people exiting the pathway here and a similar thing also happened to a person on a mountain bike more recently, luckily a car was not coming round the blind bend that time. If this can be looked at as part of your safety plan and reported back, as I am concerned about the positioning of the bollards for pedestrian users of the new path. It would be a shame if there was an accident</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> First, HCC has indicated to us that it should be possible to replace the unsightly bollards with something more suitable (that still restricts vehicle access) in the next Financial year (i.e. from March 2022). Longer term, it seems likely that a well-defined off-road footway will be required on the HCC verge on the inside of the bend, that will then transform into the proposed on-road footway a little further along Kings Hill. The replacements for the bollards will therefore need to accommodate that footway on the verge. It will always be the case that pedestrians crossing the road at that bend will need to take the utmost care. Perhaps some thought could be given to signage or other measures that could encourage those exiting the woodland to walk to the drive of 1 Kings Hill (or further) before attempting to cross the road. We have already been in contact with HCC about this matter.</p>

here after all the effort that was put into planning and creating the new path through the woods.	
<u>Form#19</u> Whilst I accept that the priority and focus needs to be on the Medstead Road / Kings Hill road area, there is one particular high risk area on Wellhouse Road namely on the blind bend at the bottom adjacent to the Village Hall land where gravity encourages vehicles travelling down the road to excessive speeds. As a separate request and without needing to involve Highways, I can see that a one off, major cutting back of the Village Hall hedge in that area (height and depth) could dramatically improve the visibility round that bend allowing drivers to respond accordingly. The annual hedge "trim" could then resume and maintain this improved visibility.	<u>Council Response</u> This is something that you should take up directly with the Village Hall Trustees, who we are sure will oblige.
<u>Form#21</u> Thanks for taking on this work.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#23</u> May I use this opportunity to thank the Road Safety Group for all the hard work they have done to produce these proposals and their report. I sincerely hope our elected County Council will support and implement these proposals.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#26</u> Average speed cameras up the entire length of Medstead Road / Kings Hill to stop the dick heads who do 70mph all the way up. Fines and points to follow.  <u>Form#27</u> Average speed cameras in the village resulting in fines for offenders would surely help stop the speeders.	<u>Council Response</u> Unfortunately the police will not deploy their own technology on roads with an accident rate as low as ours. But we are trialling average speed Community SpeedWatch cameras.
<u>Form#28</u> Good luck with this, it's not easy to reconcile all the different views/needs.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#31</u> I believe there is a need to provide/obtain some information about pedestrian demand on the various sections of footway. The demand and thus the need for a scheme adjacent to the village centre must be higher than at the top section of Kings Hill.	<u>Council Response</u> We don't feel it necessary to delay the project to obtain precise demand figures for each section, as to us it is self-evident that demand will be highest in the village centre (on which trips will tend to converge) than elsewhere. That's why we have set out the construction priority in the way we have (and construction may be phased over several years), and why we are relaxed about deferring the section at the top of Kings Hill.
<u>Form#33</u> We would like to thank and congratulate the working party on such an impressive piece of work on the most important issue that faces our village. Their meticulous investigations of the safety issues, the options for improvement and their selection of the best options does them great credit and hopefully heralds an improved road safety for all users both vehicular and pedestrian, although any solution will have inevitable compromises these appear to be the best available. We are indebted to their time, enthusiasm, innovation and energy spent on the project and support wholeheartedly the proposals.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.
<u>Form#35</u> The main issue is speeding and excessive speeding of a few drivers. While general measures proposed are good and will undoubtedly help, I feel speed cameras, logging number plates of offending vehicles and effective fining of repeat/extreme offenders will pay greatest rewards. I appreciate financial constraints for automatic penalties etc but police intervention must be based on all offenders above a certain speed (eg 40/50mph) rather than only the 'worst 3'	<u>Council Response</u> We sympathise with your opinions and sentiments about speed cameras. Unfortunately the police will not deploy their own technology on roads with an accident rate as low as ours. But we are trialling average speed Community SpeedWatch cameras.

for example. Repeat offending locals with numerous speeding episodes <u>must</u> be targeted too. Letters are generally ignored by repeat offenders.	
<u>Form#39</u> It's really quite frightening walking along the road from the Hall towards Medstead now.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted.
<u>Form#47</u> I'd like to see more effort directed towards encouraging walkers and cyclists to take greater responsibility and make themselves visible. Decades ago we had a campaign "wear something white at night". The simple act of wearing or carrying a bright, florescent article when walking/cycling would make a big difference to visibility, ... during the daytime due to the deep shadow in places, as well as during evening/night-time. The number of walkers I see, dressed in dull colours and often with headphones so that they can't hear the traffic either, is terrifying.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed, but these measures can be taken <b>in addition</b> to the sort of footways that we are proposing. The parish council could promote this message through Beech News, for example. But ultimately no one can police what people wear.
<u>Form#48</u> Walkers should take greater steps to wear reflective clothing and carry a torch at night.	
<u>Form#51</u> Essential with more housing in the area. The road is a rat run. Every time I venture out onto the road as a pedestrian I feel my life is at risk. Very few drivers adhere to speed limits or safe road conditions.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#53</u> Having spent a number of fruitless years working on the Beech Speedwatch Team and being frustrated by a total reluctance of the Beech Parish Council and EHDC to act on suggestions, it is great to see some more positive response now. All credit to the BRSWG for their persistence and progress.	<u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you. We are now trialling average speed Community SpeedWatch cameras, with the endorsement of HCC.
<u>Form#54</u> Not all other options seem to have considered. i.e walkways behind the properties in Medstead Road and better use of Wellhouse Road as a footway. The use of pedestrian crossing to slow traffic also seems to have been ignored. Official signage in the village is appallingly poor.	<u>Council Response</u> The Working Group viewed those routing options as not helping pedestrian traffic to and from properties on Medstead Road between the village hall and the Bushy Leaze Wood entrance. A pedestrian crossing, which would need good visibility both ways, would be so infrequently used that it would not be likely to slow traffic, and it would overly urbanise the area.
<u>Form#55</u> Safer footways will be a fantastic asset for the village.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed.
<u>Form#58</u> The drains/soakaways should be cleaned/maintained regularly.	<u>Council Response</u> Agreed. We chase up HCC to do this when the grips and ditches become blocked. New off-road footways will need to be designed so that the grips and ditches can be cleared and maintained.
<u>Form#60</u> In an e-mail to the Chairman of the RSWG approximately 18 months ago I stated " be careful what you wish for ". We agree that the Medstead road needs an off road footpath along the entire length. The dangers to pedestrians are self evident. A solution that will necessitate pedestrians, including children, stepping out of a concealed footpath onto a strip of coloured tarmac is more dangerous than just walking in the road. The land to do this is already available. That availability has no end date. I fear that the only proper solution has been placed in the "Too difficult" box without full exploration.	<u>Council Response</u> We have been consulting on a summary design concept. The situation you describe, the transition from an off-road to an on-road footway at a particular location, will be dealt with at the next (detailed design) stage. This will include dialogue with, and oversight from, HCC on both highways and road safety matters, which will feed into the detailed design. Your concerns are not being ignored.
<u>Form#63</u> In the proposal much is made of the scheme promoting 'social cohesion'. I fail to see how this can be when it encourages a faster section of the road in the middle of the village. Perhaps as Sections	<u>Council Response</u> The project aim is to provide a footway along Medstead Road and Kings Hill in order that residents can walk safely through their own village. The

<p>D&amp;E are less densely populated, the residents are in some way viewed as of less concern. The map is a perfect representation of the divided village and the proposed solution is in itself divisive. Whilst the scheme rightly addresses the concerns of residents in the narrow sections of 'upper' and 'lower' Beech, it gives scant consideration to those in Sections D&amp;E.</p> <p>The way to proceed is with a coherent consistent 'on-road' footpath from top to bottom of the village and a 20mph speed limit throughout. Let the woodland in Beech continue to be a village leisure amenity, not part of a poor road safety solution for which it is ill-suited.</p>	<p>paramount aim is the safety of the pedestrians, not reducing the traffic speed. Speed reduction may be part of a solution, in parts of the village, that achieves more safety for pedestrians.</p> <p>The safest solution for pedestrians is self-evidently removing them from the carriageway, which is why pavements and other off-road footways are ubiquitous. The reason we are not suggesting that solution everywhere is that in the village centre, and to a lesser extent in Kings Hill, there is virtually no HCC-owned verge/land on either side of the road. If such land had been available, we would be proposing an off-road footway, on HCC land next to the road, right through the village. Indeed we are certain that the residents in the village centre would be demanding an off-road footway if it were available to them.</p> <p>So the on-road footways being proposed are, in fact, a sub-optimal solution when it comes to pedestrian safety. Fortunately they are expected to have a mitigating side effect in that the apparent narrowing of the road should cause traffic to drive slightly more carefully and slowly, in line with precedents elsewhere.</p> <p>So in sections D &amp; E, under these proposals, the result would be a far superior pedestrian safety solution than currently exists, or will exist elsewhere, whilst traffic speeds in those sections will be largely unaltered (whilst there may be a small reduction in speeds elsewhere). We don't consider that to be divisive or unfair treatment for those residents who live in sections D &amp; E. Indeed, since the aim is to permit residents to walk safely through the village, every resident will have the benefit of every piece of footway infrastructure throughout the village. We don't believe that off-road footpaths, close to the road, will have any detrimental effect on the woodlands themselves, which are already completely accessible to the public.</p> <p>We do not currently propose a 20mph limit throughout the entire village. If HCC changes its policy to allow new 20mph zones, it may choose to revert to permitting them only in urban areas and built-up residential areas in villages. In Beech's case, that may point to the village centre only. But, as and when HCC's policy changes, this is a discussion we can have with them.</p>
<p><u>Form#64</u> I also feel that speeds are far too high in Wellhouse Road and need to be addressed as part of this exercise or separately.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We acknowledge that some cars speed on Wellhouse Road. A 20mph zone in the village centre will inevitably include Wellhouse Road. We could consider unofficial '20 is plenty' or similar signs for Wellhouse Road in the meantime, as part of some sort of publicity drive to reduce vehicle speeds of Wellhouse Road residents and their visitors.</p>
<p><u>Form#65</u> Just thank you for attempting to do something. It must be pretty difficult getting the county council to agree to anything worthwhile.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#70</u></p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>

<p>As my comments throughout suggest, I do not see this proposal as a full solution to the very real problem we face of SPEED through our narrow roads in Beech. To be truly safe and successful a footway must be accompanied by safe road use. I am more than a little concerned that focus will shift away from full adherence and enforcement of the speed limit if HCC allow this footway proposal to proceed, that it may be seen as a 'solution'. We must not ignore the dangers on the roads while we focus on footways. Why may we not have average speed enforcement on our village roads? Might that offer better overall value for the village than spending on footways? I am very grateful for all the hard work done by those who have committed their time and involvement. Some ideas are indeed innovative and practical in equal measure. Whilst there are aspects of the proposal I disagree with, this does not detract from my overall admiration for those involved and my general support of the proposals.</p>	<p>The project aim is to provide a footway along Medstead Road and Kings Hill in order that residents can walk safely through their own village. The paramount aim is the safety of the pedestrians, not reducing the traffic speed. Speed reduction may be part of a solution, in parts of the village, that achieves more safety for pedestrians.</p> <p>Spending on speeding enforcement comes from police budgets. Funding for the footway project will not, so there is no read across between the two. Bluntly, to the police and HCC, the accident rate in Beech doesn't merit any more action on speed limits and enforcement than is currently in place. In that respect, Beech is no different to hundreds of other rural villages in Hampshire.</p>
<p><u>Form#71</u> The proposal suggests the new on-road footways will last for &lt;20years. Who will pay for their re-instatement when the road needs resurfacing? (Kings Hill has been resurfaced at least twice in the last 12 years and the current surface is breaking up at the top of Medstead Road). Plus the perennial roadworks associated with burst water mains, gas, water and sewerage pipe works. I note that Hampshire Highways have said they will not maintain the proposed on-road footways.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Actually the BRSWG report states that the preferred option (light coloured tarmac) should last for &gt;20 years. The working assumption is that after the initial build (probably not funded by HCC), the on-road footway becomes part of the HCC-owned carriageway asset and therefore the responsibility of HCC to maintain. This will, of course, need to be confirmed with HCC before construction.</p>
<p><u>Form#76</u> We need to evaluate techniques to improve pedestrian safety when crossing the Medstead Road at the points where the woodland walks intersect with the Medstead Road eg at the road up to the Recreation Ground and at the Bushy Leaze crossing to the unadopted section of Wellhouse Road. As a minimum we need to improve visibility at these junctions but also consider a more structured approach to increase safety/priority in crossing the road.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Any issues of restricted visibility can be looked at. More structured road crossings are generally only justifiable where there are no or few natural breaks in the traffic that allow pedestrians to cross the road – which is not the case on Medstead Road. They would also detract from the rural look of the village.</p>
<p><u>Form#81</u> The establishment of a footway from end to end of the village is essential for the safety of those walking through the village and to different parts of it.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Agreed.</p>
<p><u>Form#83</u> One of our cars has an inbuilt Sat Nav which displays road speed. It thinks Medstead Road and Kings Hill are both 60mph (although we know it is 30mph). It's not just this car, others have reported this on Nextdoor. There are very few 30mph signs along the roadside.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> No doubt you have taken this up with the SatNav suppliers concerned. We would be interested in hearing their response. The use of 30mph repeater signs in zones where there are street lights is not consistent with road traffic regulations. There used to be some in Beech but they were removed by HCC.</p>
<p><u>Form#84</u> It must be recognised that no scheme can combat the issues caused by inconsiderate/irresponsible road users irrespective of whether they are drivers, cyclists, runners or walkers, and these issues can endanger all road users. In reality, all road users must be encouraged to recognise that the road is a shared resource for the use of all and all users must be considerate and accommodate all other users. Any suggestion that any one group of road user is deliberately targetting another is not helpful and does not promote the buy in required from the whole community. In order to 'improve road safety and promote non-vehicular travel for the whole village' these proposals need to address the issue of through traffic in Beech. Can the committee confirm how many vehicle movements in Beech actually result from journeys solely within Beech that could be replaced by non-vehicular travel versus through traffic? This</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The aim of the project is to tackle the almost total lack of pedestrian facilities through Beech. No fingers are being pointed at others. There is through traffic through Beech, and there always will be as it is the direct route from Alton to Medstead village, Wield and Preston Candover. Quantifying it (as opposed to 'in-village' traffic) will not determine whether or not there is a need for pedestrian footways, or whether people feel unsafe walking on the roads (which they do). Maintenance is an important issue that will be addressed fully at the detailed design stage. The parish council is acutely aware of funding and expenditure matters, in all areas.</p>



<p>would enable a clearer understanding of the anticipated benefits of the proposed footway schemes. The proposal does not detail a long term maintenance plan for the new footways or confirm who would be responsible for this or how it would be funded. For example, on-road footways without adequate verge management will become increasing narrow forcing users out into the main carriage way again and similarly over grown off-road footways will not be used. Has the committee considered a more radical idea of converting the Beech/Wivelrod loop into a one way system, this could not only liberate road space for a footway throughout Beech but would also mitigate the dangers vehicle users encounter cause by the narrowness and twisty nature of much of the road.</p>	<p>The road through Wivelrod and Thedden is significantly narrower and twistier than through Beech, and completely unsuitable for regular use by heavier vehicles. It isn't a realistic candidate for handling significant traffic on a permanent basis. Such a one way system would embed permanently the strong complaints of residents when the road through Beech is closed for repair.</p>
<p><u>Form#86</u> I am extremely in favour of this project, as I am scared of walking my dogs to the woods and so frequently see cars even speeding up when they pass me. I even drive from 72 Medstead Rd to Bushy Leaze Wood to avoid the fear of cars clipping me. My 12 and 14 year old children feel rather isolated from walking out of the drive, and should be able to walk up to the recreation ground or the village green without fear of being hit. I am scared to let them!</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#88</u> No other comments but would like to express our thanks for all the work the BRSWG has put in to make Beech a safer place.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#90</u> Just to pass on my thanks to all those involved to date in trying to improve pedestrian/cyclists/horse rider safety in the village; much appreciated.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#92</u> Works also need to be undertaken to cut back the overgrown vegetation throughout the village and approaches.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> It is the responsibility of the landowner (perhaps prompted by HCC) to cut back growth emanating from their property, and the responsibility of HCC to cut back growth emanating from their roadside verges etc. We can take this up with HCC; no doubt their operations have been affected by the pandemic.</p>
<p><u>Form#94</u> I am concerned about the width of the proposed pavement – the wider (within reason) the better + I am also hoping that the pavement will reduce the speeding but we also need to have the road speed reduced to 20mph in the sections where the pavement is in place. I know what is written in the highway code about there being no need for speed signs to act as reminders on roads with street lights. But what more can be done to 'remind' drivers of the speed limit?</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> The width of the footways is currently planned to be 1 – 1.5 metres, which should be adequate. In the village centre we would expect the on-road footway to reinforce voluntary compliance with a 20mph limit, and the combination to effect a greater reduction in average speed than would be achieved by either measure alone. In a 20mph zone it may be permissible and desirable to install speed limit reminder signs at appropriate intervals,</p>
<p><u>Form#95</u> We are not in support of the current proposals as they do not offer a consistent approach to the problems of speeding vehicles and the related risks to pedestrians. The proposed solution moves from on-road to off-road and vice versa thereby forcing pedestrians on and off the road at different and particularly dangerous points. It does not provide a clear and consistent message to drivers who are faced with varying road widths, slower one minute, faster the next, pedestrians at times in the road and pedestrians at times off the road. This approach is therefore likely to confuse both drivers and pedestrians alike. We have an additional concern that the focus of these proposals is in the wrong place: addressing pedestrian behaviour rather than attempting to reduce average vehicle speeds. Why do the current proposals make no mention of any approach other than footpath related solutions (ie traffic calming, chicanes, etc). There appear to be no costings ongoing maintenance of the</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u> We do not believe that consistency is of as much benefit as you state. For pedestrians, walking routes everywhere are typically very varied over relatively short distances – it's normal. In the proposed scheme, each continuous stretch of on-road or off-road footway is several hundred metres long. For drivers there are just two discrete stretches of on-road footway that are out of the ordinary, but which will no doubt have some HCC warning signage; we don't consider that confusing for drivers. As regard traffic speeds, HCC does not support new physical traffic calming measures such as speed bumps or pinch points. Alongside the footways project the parish council is actively pursuing reduced speed limits and speed enforcement, as evidenced by Q.13 and</p>

<p>proposed scheme and we would suggest that this be addressed as a priority.</p> <p>In conclusion, a clear, single, concise and consistent approach throughout the length of Medstead Road is crucial. This would therefore translate into either an on-road footpath throughout the whole of Medstead Road or alternative solutions need to be investigated or the road remains as it is and it is accepted as a dangerous road not suited to pedestrians.</p>	<p>Q.14, and so speeding is not being ignored. It is also the case that, with no footways, pedestrian safety is still compromised by traffic that adheres to the speed limit, so the footways project is valid in its own right. Methods, costs and responsibilities for footway maintenance are on our radar and will be addressed during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>We disagree with your conclusion that it would be better to accept the status quo than to put in place the mix of on-road and off-road footpaths, plus further speed limits and enforcement where achievable.</p>
<p><u>Form#98</u></p> <p>It is a very difficult road to make adjustments to and before I used it on foot didn't think much about it, however as a regular walker on the road particularly when the wood are very muddy, it would be lovely to have better walkways</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#104</u></p> <p>A very important and significant project. Thank you to all.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>Noted, thank you.</p>
<p><u>Form#105</u></p> <p>This document is to be welcomed! For many years speeding traffic and the lack of positive facilities for pedestrians and equestrians going through the village has been the subject of complaints. I would like to see cyclists given more emphasis within a final scheme as this is the direction of Government policy as I read it.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>Noted, thank you. Formal HCC-approved design of the new footways to also be able to simultaneously accommodate cyclists and horse riders would greatly increase the width of the footways, and hence the cost of constructing them. We believe the use of the new footways by pedestrians will not be so intense as to prevent their informal use by horse riders and cyclists (particularly children) if they so choose, in much the same way as the footpath to the A339 is used by some horse riders and cyclists now.</p>
<p><u>Form#107</u></p> <p>More contact should be made with residents likely to be affected by these proposals.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>Agreed. We have identified a number of residents that the Working Group needs to speak to immediately, if and when the detailed design phase starts.</p>
<p><u>Form#108</u></p> <p>Very concerned at the cost of the program versus the supposed rewards. I believe the pathway between 27 to 91 would just be used as a road surface or worse people would drive badly up the wrong side of an already narrow road.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>Noted. Similar on-road footways have been put in place elsewhere, to the satisfaction of the residents.</p>
<p><u>Form#110</u></p> <p>Excellent effort on your individual parts.</p>	<p><u>Council Response</u></p> <p>Noted, thank you.</p>

**Q.17 Would you like to join the small group of volunteers on the Beech Road Safety Working group, to help move this project forward?**

Total responses: - YES 11 (10%) NO 99 (90%) – NB. YES figure includes the four current Working Group members.