

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL'S TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

1. INTRODUCTION

- # 1.1 One of the Council's key targets for 2006/07 is the review of its Traffic Management Strategy. The draft Strategy is attached as Appendix A.

2. CONSULTATIONS

- 2.1 The first version of the suggested Strategy has been prepared in consultation with a number of partners including:
- Hampshire County Council
 - Police
 - National Park Authority
 - Forestry Commission
- # 2.2 Further consultations with the above organisations, Town & Parish Councils and District Councillors have been undertaken. Their responses are set out in Appendix B which includes responses from District officers. # Where indicated, the Strategy which is attached as Appendix A has been amended to take account of comments.
- 2.3 It should be noted from HCC's comments that the current the parking clock scheme has HCC consent up until the end of December 2007 and authorisation from HCC will need to be sought for its retention.
- 2.4 The Economy and Planning Review Panel considered the draft Strategy on 20 September, minute 16 refers newforest.gov.uk/committeedocs/eprp/CDM02052.pdf . The Strategy # attached as Appendix A incorporates the amendments referred to.
- 2.5 A Citizen's Panel Survey was undertaken during September 2006. The # full results are at newforest.gov.uk/citizenspanel . Extracts are set out in Appendix 3 of the draft Strategy.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- # 3.1 These are set out in the draft Strategy attached as Appendix A.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- # 4.1 These are set out in the draft Strategy attached as Appendix A.

5. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- # 5.1 These mainly relate to enforcement and are set out in the draft Strategy attached as Appendix A.

6. PORTFOLIO HOLDER COMMENTS

- 6.1 The Portfolio Holder supports the recommendations in the report.

7. RECOMMENDATION

- # 7.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet approves the Traffic Management Strategy attached as Appendix A.

For further information please contact:

Nick Hunt
Principal Engineer (Transportation)
Tel: 023 8028 5916
E-mail: nick.hunt@nfdc.gov.uk

Background Papers

Published papers

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL'S DRAFT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION
2. BACKGROUND
3. CURRENT SITUATION
4. VISION
5. STRATEGY OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES
6. ASSESSMENT OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS
7. STRATEGY AIMS
8. STRATEGY POLICIES

VISION

To enhance the quality of life and economic prosperity through effective traffic management measures that meet the needs of the District.

Statement by the Leader of the District Council

The Council is striving to balance the needs of a range of people in the district, local residents, motorists, businesses and other organisations such as community centres. We want to encourage a greater turnover in our town and village centre car parks and encourage commuters to question whether they really need to use their own cars to get to work.

STRATEGY AIMS

- Aim A** - To contribute towards maintaining the financial viability of the District's Town, Village and local centres through effective traffic management.
- Aim B** - To improve road safety.
- Aim C** - To minimise congestion.
- Aim D** - To reduce dependence on the private car where there is a suitable alternative.
- Aim E** - To improve the environment/quality of life through traffic management measures.
- Aim F** - To work in partnership with other agencies to co-ordinate traffic management/regulation throughout the District.
- Aim G** - To have parking standards for new development that take account of the characteristics of the area (excludes National Park).
- Aim H** - To set and review on and off street parking charges that are compatible with other strategy aims.

The Strategy Policies that relate to these aims are set out in Section 8.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 New Forest District Council, in partnership with Hampshire County Council (HCC) and others, has a key role with on and off street parking and traffic regulation. One of the District Council's key targets for 2006/07 is the review of its Traffic Management Strategy. Another key target for 2006/07 is the evaluation of charging options for on-street parking within the District.
- 1.2 This Strategy, when approved, will set out how the District Council plans to manage and co-ordinate the various linked functions it deals with, either in its own right or under the Agency Agreements it has with HCC. The policy framework will be set by the District Council for the functions it deals with in its own right. For the functions covered by Agency Agreement the policy framework is decided by HCC. The Strategy includes policies for the following:
 - 1.2.1 Traffic Regulation (Agency function)
 - 1.2.2 On-street car parking restrictions and enforcement (Agency function)
 - 1.2.3 Public off-street parking (District function)
 - 1.2.4 Residents' Parking Schemes (District function within HCC policy framework)
 - 1.2.5 Off-street Parking Charges (District function requiring HCC consent)
 - 1.2.6 On-street Parking Charges (Potential Agency function)
- 1.3 Traffic regulation covers both moving and stationary traffic on the public highway (and in some cases on private land) and impacts on all road users. HCC is the local highway authority and, acting as their agent, the District Council undertakes a number of traffic regulation functions on their behalf. It has been agreed that initial enquiries relating to traffic management (except for motorways and trunk roads) should be directed to the District Council as their Agent. The Highways Agency is responsible for traffic management on motorways and trunk roads (e.g. M27 and A31) and this strategy excludes such roads.
- 1.4 This consultation draft is the first stage in the review of the District Council's Traffic Management Strategy. It sets out the main elements for discussion in general terms. Key stakeholders will be consulted during Summer 2006 and it is anticipated that the Strategy will be adopted during Winter 2006/07.
- 1.5 The omission of area specific proposals is deliberate as these would need to be justified by survey data such as traffic flows, pedestrian counts, recorded injury accident information, traffic speeds and parking data. Recorded injury accident (RIA) information is kept for

the whole area. Apart from RIA information and parking data, most other information is collected as required in connection with a site specific issue. Given:

- the recent changes associated with the introduction of decriminalised parking enforcement
- changes to the parking clock scheme
- the possibility on-street parking charges

the reliability of any survey data collected at this time would be questionable. As parking patterns stabilise survey data will be collected and this will be used to develop area specific proposals that conform to the general policies set out in this Strategy.

- 1.6 The omission of detailed parking standards for new development in this strategy is also deliberate. Policy G1 refers. These standards will need to be included in the appropriate planning authority's Local Development Framework and the preparation and adoption of these standards is covered by legislation and statutory regulation. The District Council is the Planning Authority responsible for the District excluding the National Park. The New Forest National Park Authority (NPA) is planning authority for the National Park area.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 National Transport policy has moved away from "*predict and provide*". HCC's LTP for 2006-2011 has the over arching theme "*reduce, manage and invest*". Unrestrained traffic growth is no longer considered sustainable and the associated adverse environmental implications are generally considered unacceptable.

- 2.2 During recent years the District Council has not been able to safeguard town centre sites for additional public car parking provision nor has it the financial resources available to provide a significant number of new public parking spaces.

- 2.3 Until recently the guiding principle relating to the District Council's policy on public car parking has been to "maintain the viability of town and village centres". The increasing problems associated with congestion and traffic related air pollution has highlighted the need to review traffic and parking related policies and priorities.

- 2.4 Under the agency agreement dated 20 August 2003 with HCC, the District Council exercises some traffic management/regulation functions on behalf of HCC in accordance with laid down procedures.

Appendix 2 refers to the different types of traffic regulation orders (TROs). Advisory signs, traffic bollards and road markings are also used to influence the behaviour of road users. Measures to benefit particular groups or road users include residents parking schemes and disabled parking (legally enforceable and advisory). It also includes temporary road closures and other temporary Orders for special events or essential work within the highway. In practice NFDC makes most of the parking restrictions and all temporary road closures.

- 2.5 The District Council also has an agency agreement with HCC covering decriminalised parking enforcement dated 28 October 2005.
- 2.6 Other than through the development control process the District Council has a limited opportunity to influence how private non-residential car parks and car parks owned/administered by other authorities are managed other than through voluntary arrangements. However it is acknowledged that this is an important area of work and that there is a potential for partnership working that the District Council is keen to explore. Examples of private non-residential car parks include:
- Parking at visitor attractions
 - Work place car parks
 - Customer car parks (shopping centres/supermarkets)
 - Railway Station/Wight Link Ferry car parks
 - Crown Lands/Forestry Commission car parks
 - Public car parks (not operated by NFDC) – e.g. Totton Town Council’s Civic Centre car park
- 2.7 A report “Review of Town Parking Clock and Charging Scheme” - nfdc.gov.uk/committeedocs/eprp/NFR91199.pdf (NFDC’s Economy & Planning Review Panel, 19 January 2005) considered the issues associated with the clock and charges scheme that operated from January 2003. It concluded that this scheme improved the opportunities to park in short stay spaces but had little impact on long stay parking. A revised charging scheme was subsequently introduced, details at nfdc.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=4976

3. CURRENT SITUATION

- 3.1 The predominant mode of travel in the District is the private car (84% of households in the District have access to a car or van (2001 census). The accessibility maps recently provided by HCC demonstrate that many parts of the District are not at all well served by public transport.
- 3.2 Even if LTP aspirations regarding traffic management are met traffic is likely to grow at approximately 1% per annum.
- 3.3 The adverse impact of traffic is a concern for many communities. Identified concerns include:
- traffic speeds
 - risk of injury
 - community severance due to busy roads
 - local roads not suitable for volume and type of traffic (e.g. lorries).

Please refer to the results of the Citizens’ Panel at Appendix 3. Where justified, (there is often detailed guidance available on this), appropriate traffic management measures can be introduced. The Department for Transport has recently produced guidance for the

setting of speed limits, dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_rdsafety/documents/page/dft_rdsafety_612262.pdf. In some cases restrictions, such as lower speed limits, may be introduced but there is a high level of non compliance – 50% of vehicles in built up areas exceed 30 mph limit speed limit (link to report dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstats/documents/downloadable/dft_transstats_611476.pdf) so changing a speed limit may not reduce the speeds as hoped for. The availability of Police resources to undertake enforcement is an important consideration. In the case of speed related complaints, “community reassurance” is currently often undertaken (e.g. Police visit and/or speed indicator device deployment). HCC & the Police have a pilot “Speed Watch” scheme in part of the District.

- 3.4 The needs of people with disabilities are important. Disabled spaces in public car parks and on-street are provided. When considering new proposals their needs are taken into consideration

Road Safety

- 3.5 Traffic management measures are often used to deal with locations which have a pattern of accidents with a treatable cause. The need to reduce the numbers of road casualties is a priority for key stakeholders including HCC, Police, Health Service providers and the District Council. The Hampshire Local Area Agreement and Local Public Service Agreement 2 (LPSA2) include the target:

Reducing the numbers of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) on Hampshire’s public roads.

1994/98 average	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
1054	986	874	939	866	670	613

LPSA2 Performance target

684 KSI casualties on average per year over the four year LPSA2 period of 1st January 2005 - 31st December 2008 (it is estimated that without LPSA2 enhancement 304 more people would be killed or seriously injured over the four year LPSA2 period).

Casualty Figures for NFDC Area

Year	Fatal (K)	Serious (S)	Slight	KSI in NFDC Area
94-98 ave	9	136	820	145
2003	18	127	845	145
2004	15	92	711	107
2005	15	108	709	123

- # 3.6 Traffic conditions in and around schools continue to raise concerns including the safety of child pedestrians and child cyclists. Please also refer to the results of the Citizens' Panel at Appendix 3. School Travel Plans are being developed by many local schools. Requests for more effective measures to control parking near schools are anticipated.

Congestion and Traffic Related Air Pollution

- 3.7 The combined effects of congestion, closely spaced buildings and unfavourable topography can result in a build up of traffic related pollution. In some cases the pollution levels are above statutory limits. Lyndhurst and Totton include areas that are unfortunately examples of this. There is a statutory obligation to seek to improve air quality so that pollution levels do not exceed the set thresholds. Traffic related air pollution levels have resulted in the declaration of Air Quality Management Areas for parts of both Lyndhurst and Totton.
- 3.8 Even the most optimistic predictions are for traffic volumes to increase. This will increase congestion and, in some areas, reduce air quality. Congestion also results in increased costs for business and frustrates drivers generally. It is important that measures, such as parking restrictions, be considered so as to minimise avoidable delays on the main traffic routes.
- 3.9 A Highways Agency's Regional Network Report for the South East (August 2006) refers to the M27 and A31. For the M27 congestion is currently a major issue at peak hours. For the M27 to the west of Junction 3 its current "observed stress level" is "90-100% stress". For the A31 the current observed stress levels vary:

- "90-100% stress" for the majority of its length across the District
- "More than 100 stress" at Ringwood

By 2026 it is anticipated that the observed stress level for the whole of the M27 and all of the A31 through the District will be "more than 100%". Drivers can be expected to increasingly look for less congested alternatives (already happens when there are incidents and/or road works on the A31).

- # 3.10 Referring to the results of the Citizens' Panel at Appendix 3. There is support for measure such as parking restrictions on main traffic routes to reduce congestion caused by parking.

Parking

- 3.11 The current off-street parking charges scheme, which includes the "parking clock", was introduced in 2004. More information can be found at nfdc.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=1639 .
- 3.12 NFDC manages 6487 off-street spaces. More information can be found at nfdc.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=5046 .

3.13 Through the traffic management/decriminalised parking enforcement agreement New Forest District Council with HCC currently has a strong influence on on-street parking arrangements. This includes the making (subject to statutory procedures and agency arrangements with HCC) and enforcement of on-street parking and loading restrictions. However, HCC have indicated that they want to review traffic management agreements.

3.14 A survey of public attitudes in some Town Centres was undertaken by consultants in 2005/06. Please also refer to the results of the Citizens' Panel at Appendix 3.

#

Table 1

	SURVEY	% OF DRIVERS STATING ABLE TO PARK IN 1 st CHOICE LOCATION	PARKING VERY GOOD OR QUITE GOOD	PARKING VERY POOR OR QUITE POOR
LYMINGTON	in-street survey of shoppers	92%	52.9%	23.8%
	Business occupiers survey		7.1%	80.3%
	50.0% of the businesses considered the 'availability and location of car parking' to be an issue constraining their business			
NEW	in-street survey of shoppers	87%	51.9%	17.9%
MILTON	Business occupiers survey		30.0%	50.0%
	31.4% of the businesses considered the 'availability and location of car parking' to be an issue constraining their business			
RINGWOOD	in-street survey of shoppers	88%	68.5%	13.4%
	Business occupiers survey		29.3%	48.2%
	43.1% of the businesses considered the 'availability and location of car parking' to be an issue constraining their business			

	SURVEY	% OF DRIVERS STATING ABLE TO PARK IN 1st CHOICE LOCATION	PARKING VERY GOOD OR QUITE GOOD	PARKING VERY POOR OR QUITE POOR
TOTTON	in-street survey of shoppers	87%	69.7%	12.1%
	Business occupiers survey		55%	27.5%
	20% of the businesses considered the 'availability and location of car parking' to be an issue constraining their business			

- 3.15 The effects of introducing different pricing between long and short stay clocks have yet to be assessed through "length of stay"/car park occupancy/surveys. However, ad-hoc spot inspections do indicate more free spaces in long stay public car parks and residents have reported a limited increase in the amount of on-street parking in unrestricted roads. The numbers of clocks sold are shown in table 2. The current parking clock scheme has HCC consent up until the end of December 2007 and authorisation from HCC will be required to allow it to continue after then. The following is the link to HCC's decision
hants.gov.uk/decisions/decisions-docs/051011-exmrnh-R1014135256.html .

Table 2

	2004#	2005*	2006
		Whole Year	Part Year (to 31 st July)
Total	65, 440	59,974	51,279
Short Stay	*	*	46,887
Long Stay / Mid Stay	*	*	2,535
Other Clocks	*	*	1,857

* single clock covering long and short stay.
clocks valid to 31 December 2004

- 3.16 In many areas businesses do not have off-street loading and their future often depends upon on-street loading. Loading is a legitimate use of street space. As on-street parking pressures increase consideration will need to be given for loading bays to assist local businesses.

Additional off-street public parking

- 3.17 In previous years local development plans identified sites for additional public car parking (extensions or new car parks). These safeguarded sites have either been developed as car parks or, in a few cases, granted planning permission for other uses. The only significant proposals relate to making temporary car parks permanent and ad hoc opportunities for small extensions. Proposals to improve Fordingbridge A338 Slip Road Car Park and St John's Street Car Park, Hythe are now programmed for 2006/07. Ad hoc opportunities are likely to continue to arise from time to time to provide small extensions to existing car parks.

Environmental Issues and Partnership Working

- 3.18 There are adverse traffic impacts on the New Forest National Park. New Forest District Council is keen to work in partnership with the National Park Authority and the Forestry Commission and other stakeholders to minimise these adverse impacts. Current projects include animal casualty reduction and the New Forest Tour. It is hoped that there will be effective partnership working relating to transport related issues for NFDC's Local Development Framework (LDF) and the NPA's LDF.
- 3.19 Whilst traffic management can help reduce adverse traffic impacts it can have an adverse impact on the environment. Most traffic management proposals include signs and/or lines and, sometimes, coloured surfacing. All have a visual impact and, especially in environmentally sensitive areas, this has to be balanced against the benefits of traffic management proposals. Signing and/or lining requirements for parking restrictions etc may limit the use of such restrictions in the National Park due to their adverse visual impact.
- 3.20 Increased demand for on street parking means that parking occurs in undesirable locations. Verge erosion, minor obstructions to property accesses and inconvenience to other road users are affected by this.

4. VISION

- 4.1 ***To enhance the quality of life and economic prosperity through effective traffic management measures that meet the needs of the District.***
- 4.2 This vision takes account of the policies and aspirations set out below.
- 4.3 Statement by the Leader of the District Council, Councillor Melville Kendal

"The council is striving to balance the needs of a range of people in the district, local residents, motorists, businesses and other organisations such as community centres. We want to encourage a greater turnover in our town and village centre car parks and encourage commuters to question whether they really need to use their own cars to get to work."

5. STRATEGY OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

5.1 The agreed priorities for transport include:

- * To reduce the impact and effect of **congestion**.
- * To increase **accessibility**
- * To promote **safety**
- * To improve **air quality**
- * To assist the **economy**
- * To enhance the **environment/quality of life**
- * To widen travel choice through **integration**
- * To encourage **value for money**

These are referred to in Hampshire County Council's (HCC) Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2006-2011 and the District Council's Economy & Planning Portfolio Holder Decision on LTP Schemes Oct 2005).

5.2 Through the current Local Area Agreement and Local Public Service Agreement 2 the District Council is committed to improving road safety generally and reducing the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on local roads. See above. Measures aimed at reducing road casualties will be given a high priority and measures that could have a detrimental impact on road safety will not be progressed.

5.3 The parking elements of the strategy are derived from a number of policy statements and aspirations.

5.3.1 To maintain the financial viability of our Town/Village centres – this has been a long held policy.

5.3.2 Encourage a turnover of vehicles in our car parks and provide as many parking opportunities as possible.

5.3.3 Set charges and regulations for long stay parking to encourage individuals to consider not using their own cars for commuting but not overburden those who have no alternative.

5.3.4 Make more on-street parking available.

5.3.5 To introduce charges for on street car parking.
(the above referred to in 7 Sept 2005 Cabinet Report C - nfdc.gov.uk/committeedocs/cab/CDR00790.pdf):

5.3.6 To improve management of off-street parking through clock scheme and charges.

5.3.7 Assist partnership working with other agencies including the Forestry Commission.

5.3.8 Co-ordinate traffic management/regulation throughout the District
(the above referred to in 5 July 2004 Cabinet Report G - nfdc.gov.uk/committeedocs/cab/NFR17571.pdf)

6. ASSESSMENT OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS

6.1 To assess experimental and permanent traffic management measures and parking controls (e.g. waiting restrictions, speed limits, signing and lining schemes) it will be necessary to carefully consider the implications. In most cases the benefits of a proposal will be off set by some disadvantages. In most cases the assessment of significant traffic management measures will be undertaken by traffic management officers in consultation with local HCC and District Members having regard to the views of key stakeholders. For some measures there are statutory consultation requirements. Area wide measures, changes to car parking charges and car park management schemes and other proposals judged to require wider consideration will be subject to the appropriate Council's decision making processes.

6.2 The assessment process will include some or all of the following depending on the significance of the measure:

- Data collection (e.g. traffic flows, speed checks, parking surveys, recorded injury accident information)
- Technical assessment
- Financial assessment
- Environmental implications
- Views of local HCC and District Council Members
- Results of non-statutory consultations
- Responses to statutory consultations
- Reference to planning and policy documents (e.g. local urban design frameworks, local transport plan, local transportation strategies, HCC's policies and procedures)
- Government/National technical advice and guidance
- Level of "self enforcement" and level of Police/Local Authority enforcement required to make measure effective

6.3 A Citizen's Panel Survey was undertaken during September 2006. The results of this will be taken into account when relevant to the proposal. The full results are at newforest.gov.uk/citizenspanel .

Extracts are set out in Appendix 3.

7. STRATEGY AIMS

Aim A - To contribute towards maintaining the financial viability of the District's town, village and local centres through effective traffic management.

Aim B - To improve road safety.

Aim C - To minimise congestion

Aim D - To reduce dependence on the private car where there is a suitable alternative.

- Aim E -** To improve the environment/quality of life, especially for residents, through traffic management measures.
- Aim F -** To work in partnership with other agencies to co-ordinate traffic Management / regulation throughout the District
- Aim G -** To have parking standards for new development that take account of the characteristics of the area (excludes National Park)
- Aim H -** To set and review on and off street parking charges that are compatible with other strategy aims.

8. STRATEGY POLICIES

The strategy policies are set out below under the appropriate strategy aim. Explanatory text under the policies is shown in italics.

Unless otherwise stated below the initial contact point for enquiries, requests etc relating to the following traffic management topics is New Forest District Council (Tel: 01590 646123 e-mail: customer.services@nfdc.gov.uk) except for the maintenance/replacement of highway signs and markings please contact Hampshire Highways (Tel: 084 5850 4422 e-mail hampshirehighways.west@hants.gov.uk).

- Aim A -** To contribute towards maintaining the financial viability of the District's town, village and local centres through effective traffic management.

Policies

- A 1 - To optimise off street parking opportunities that meet the needs of people upon which the vitality of the local community depends through parking restrictions and charges for parking on-street and in public car parks.
- A 2 - To continue to improve the management of public car parks through charges and the retention of the current clock scheme

Given the dominant mode of travel is by private car the vitality of local communities depends on adequate parking. However, not all parking activities result in benefits for the local community (e.g. public town centre parking used as park and ride car parks serving major employers outside the District). In some town centres etc. there is a legitimate need for local employee parking. However, if unrestrained, it could reduce the parking opportunities for customers. As a result parking regulations and charges needs to be framed so as to meet the essential parking needs of the community. This may involve discouraging parking that will not benefit the community. In the past the designation of short stay parking spaces has been the principal tool used to encourage a turnover of vehicles in NFDC's town/village centre car parks. More recently parking charges have been set so as to contribute towards meeting

policy objectives referred to above. The current parking clock scheme has HCC consent up until the end of December 2007 and authorisation from HCC will need to be sought for its retention. Charges for on-street parking in certain areas will be considered.

- A 3 - To optimise on-street parking provision subject to no conflicts with other objectives and policies.

On street parking is as important as off-street parking is to the vitality of local communities. For those with mobility problems it is important that those who travel by car can get close to their destinations. The availability of short-term parking close to local shopping centres helps maintain their economic vitality. In some situations, for safety, congestion, or environmental reasons, on-street parking may not be desirable. When these concerns do not apply, on-street parking should be managed to the benefit of the local community.

- A 4 - To introduce a charging scheme and management regime for on-street parking that meets the strategy objectives.

The introduction of the shoppers short stay parking clock and charges for non-clock users will encourage more on-street parking opportunities in the same way it has in off-street car parks. It is anticipated that it will be introduced in town centres where public parking is at a premium. When the options have been identified and evaluated the District Council will seek the necessary agreements with HCC. An on-street charging scheme could allow more effective enforcement of the "limited stay" waiting restrictions as only one "observation" would be necessary to establish non-compliance with the time limit.

- A 5 - To maintain effective direction signing to key commercial, industrial, visitor and retail destinations within the District.

Unnecessary congestion and environmental damage is caused by traffic, especially lorries, not using the most suitable route. Whilst local drivers can be expected to know their way to a local destination other drivers need more assistance. The level of signing will be kept to the minimum necessary and be consistent with the general principles of HCC's tourism signing policy.

- A 6 - To monitor the availability of on street and off street parking in town centres.

Regular monitoring is essential to allow the effects of changes to the management of public car parks and parking charges to be assessed and reviewed so as to inform further decision making.

Aim B - To improve road safety.

Policies

B 1 - To introduce traffic regulation orders and other traffic management measures that will effectively address the causes of recorded personal injury road traffic accidents (PIA) having regard to other priority objectives.

Meeting agreed road casualty reduction targets is a key objective for the District Council and its partners. LPSA2 refers to a jointly agreed target, see above. If there is a pattern of accidents that result in casualties, especially serious or fatal, with a treatable cause that can be addressed by a traffic regulation order (TRO) or other traffic management measure, then the presumption will be that a TRO etc will be progressed.

B 2 - To consider traffic regulation orders and other traffic management measures that reduce the risk of accidents, especially to vulnerable road users, having regard to other priority objectives.

Whilst casualty reduction is the District Council's highest road safety priority, measures to reduce the risk of accidents at sites where there are no reported personal injury accidents may be appropriate if there are demonstrable road safety benefits. Consideration will be given to TROs and measures that will significantly reduce the risk of pedestrians and cyclists, especially children, being injured. However, the use of additional signs and road markings will normally only be considered if their use conforms to Government Regulations and technical advice. HCC's Safety Engineering Team deal with locations with worst accident records and locations for effective casualty reduction schemes will be passed to them. The Department for Transport has recently produced guidance for the setting of speed limits, [dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_rdsafety/documents/p_age/dft_rdsafety_612262.pdf](https://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_rdsafety/documents/p_age/dft_rdsafety_612262.pdf)

B 3 - To assist the District-wide speed reduction initiative.

The District Council currently takes an active lead in multi-agency. NF Safer Roads Group organises a number of speed reduction initiatives. As referred to above, speeding traffic is often a major local concern with residents.

Initial Contact Point: Police Traffic Management Officer (South West Area) Police Station, 390 Shirley Road, SHIRLEY, SO15 3UG Tel: 0845 045 4545

E Mail: traffic.management@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

- B 4 - Not to introduce traffic regulation orders and other traffic management measures that just transfer problems from one area to another without any overall benefit.

It is generally accepted that it is better to tackle the cause of the problem rather than first move the problem from one location to another. Depending on the seriousness of the problem it may be necessary to consider proposals that cover the original "problem area" and also the areas into which the problem could be transferred to.

- Aim C** - To minimise congestion.

Policies

- C 1 - To consider traffic regulation orders and other traffic management measures that reduce congestion whilst having regard to other priority objectives.

Congestion can be caused or made worse by inconsiderate actions (e.g. parking that obstructs traffic on busy roads) by drivers. Measures such as waiting and loading restrictions, and box junction markings, may be appropriate on A and B classified roads or on other roads that are congested. It should be noted that in accordance with agency agreements, HCC needs to be given advance notice of measures on A & B class roads.

- Aim D** - To reduce dependence on the private car where there is a suitable alternative.

Policies

- D 1 - To consider measures that assist bus users and make public transport more reliable provided other strategy aims are not prejudiced.

Operators are buying low floor buses and HCC are investing in raised kerbs at many bus stops to assist all users, especially people with disabilities, to access buses. Also bus lay-bys minimise traffic queues at bus stops. If other vehicles park in bus lay-bys these benefits are lost and bus clearways will be considered to address this. On-street parking and loading restrictions will be considered when inconsiderate parking etc. delays buses. There may also be opportunities for bus lanes to assist buses when the roads are congested. Suggestions for bus lanes that are unlikely to have a significant detrimental impact on either congestion, air pollution or road safety will be forwarded to HCC for them to consider in more detail.

- D 2 - To encourage individuals to consider not using their own cars for commuting but not overburden those who have no alternative through parking charges and parking restrictions both on and off street.

The current car parking charges for off-street parking seek to strike this balance, see also Policy H1. Altering commuting behaviour in the District continues to be an important aspiration and the charging regime probably has the greatest potential for influencing change.

- D 3 - To provide measures to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists.

Measures could include highlighting well used uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points and the provision of limited “on-carriageway” cycle lanes. More significant works would need to be delivered through HCC’s Local Transport Plan programmes.

- Aim E** - To improve the environment/quality of life, especially for residents, through traffic management measures.

Policies

- E 1 - To consider traffic regulation orders and other traffic management measures that improve the environment/quality of life having regard to other priority objectives.

Measures to limit the use of unsuitable minor roads by lorries or through traffic will be considered especially where demonstrable harm is being caused. Dealing with lorry related problems is a high priority but legitimate needs of local businesses and communities, which are highly dependant on lorries, will be taken into account. The availability of practical alternative routes will be a key factor. Also, for restrictions to be effective they need to be readily understood by road users and enforceable by the Police. Given the other priorities the Police have, measures such as lorry restrictions need to be largely self enforcing. Suggestions will normally be assessed by the District Council and, if supported, referred to HCC. HCC consider if the proposal should be progressed and, if so, whether it will be progressed by NFDC or HCC.

- E 2 - To provide measures to assist people with disabilities.

Measures include conveniently located parking and facilities to improve accessibility. Legally enforceable on and off street parking bays are provided to cater for demand in towns and some larger villages in accordance with current guidance. The need for these “formal” spaces will be kept under review so as to meet the local need. On-street disabled parking bays will, where practical, be provided outside residential properties in line with agreed guidance (revised guidance anticipated from HCC). Other measures such as improved crossing facilities will be assessed and, if supported, requests passed to the appropriate programme manager.

- E 3 - To introduce residents parking schemes in accordance with agreed guidelines and other measures to assist residents with parking/access problems having regard to other priority objectives.

The catalyst for residents parking schemes will be requests from residents. Existing on-street schemes give residents with permits (fee charged) exemption from "length of stay" restrictions. The demand for residents schemes is low (one on-street scheme and one off-street scheme with two more on-street schemes anticipated during 2006). HCC's draft policy includes "that at least 50% of homes do not have any parking within their curtilage and that, in response to consultation with residents, more than 50% of respondents support the proposed scheme". Closely based on HCC's draft policy NFDC Guidance has been prepared (Attached as Appendix 1). A common problem for residents is the obstruction of accesses by parked vehicles. In order to assist residents "access markings" can be provided following a request by the occupier. Factors such as the severity of parking pressures (e.g. locations near schools, colleges, shopping areas or affected by employee/commuter parking) will be taken into account. Access markings to deal with mainly residential parking problems may be provided but the owner or occupier will normally be expected to contribute towards the associated costs. In addition the Police have powers to deal with obstruction of accesses.

- E 4 - To review the regulation and charging arrangements in Amenity Car Parks to facilitate visitor enjoyment of the local amenities whilst minimising both difficulties for any adjacent communities and damage to the environment.

Amenity car parks have been provided to cater for visitors. Seasonal charges apply but the period of the year covered is not always consistent with on-street waiting restrictions. This inconsistency will be addressed probably by amending on-street restrictions. The length of the "tourist season" may justify all year charging in at least some amenity car parks. Other issues associated with car parks in residential areas include on-street parking to the detriment of the adjacent area and the need to cater for residents' parking especially where there is little or no parking within individual properties.

- E 5 - To avoid the unnecessary proliferation of signs, road markings etc by not installing new permanent ones unless they both:
- Comply with the appropriate regulations and guidelines and
 - Are likely to have a demonstrable road safety, traffic management or visitor management benefit.

- E 6 - To support Highway Authority (HCC) initiatives to remove unnecessary sign clutter.

Whilst traffic management measures can have environmental benefits the visual intrusion of additional signs, lines, and coloured road surfaces needs to be balanced against the traffic management benefits. Increasingly “sign clutter” is being perceived as an issue and HCC are proposing pilots to remove unnecessary signs etc. It is therefore important that a realistic assessment of the traffic management and related benefits of new signs etc. is undertaken; especially “will the measure inform and change road user behaviour for the better”. Where new or existing signs are judged to be ineffective or unnecessary they should be removed with priority being given to environmentally sensitive areas.

- E 7 - To use traffic regulation orders (TROs) to deter inappropriate parking on highway verges where physical measures are not appropriate.

TROs (rely on regularly spaced signs - road markings not required) can be introduced to prevent parking on highway verges and footways without necessarily restricting vehicles parking on the carriageway. The Council has to progress a large number of requests for TROs. Also there is the issue of the cost and effectiveness of enforcement away from town, village and local centres. Therefore the established practice of discouraging such parking by using physical measures such as bollards, fences etc will continue to be the norm. However, where physical measures are not considered appropriate and the verge or footway parking is causing demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of the area, such restrictions will be considered. The use of local bylaws is not considered a viable alternative given the costs associated with prosecution.

- Aim F** - To work in partnership with other agencies to co-ordinate traffic management/regulation throughout the District.

Policies

- F 1 - To work in partnership with the Police, HCC and others to promote road safety and discourage anti-social driving.

- F 2 - To work in partnership with the Police, HCC, Forestry Commission, Verderers, New Forest National Park Authority and others to reduce animal accidents on unfenced Forest roads.

Please see B1, B2, B3 and supporting text. It is readily accepted that “engineering” solutions alone will not tackle all road safety concerns. Education and changing the attitudes of road users is also very important. The New Forest Road Safety Council has a key role in this and the District Council will continue to collaborate to promote road safety awareness and tackle anti-social driving through targeted initiatives. Whilst one priority is human casualty reduction the unique character of the New Forest National Park depends on grazing

by animals that are free to roam. This will be prejudiced if there are high casualty rates especially amongst stock animals. The Forest Speed Indicator Device initiative aims to reduce animal accidents.

- F 3 - To work in partnership with other agencies including the Forestry Commission and National Park Authority to identify the opportunities for enhancing the management of Forestry Commission Car Parks to facilitate visitor enjoyment of the local amenities whilst minimising both difficulties for any adjacent communities and damage to the environment.

HCC and New Forest District Council have powers to control on-street parking and manage off-street public parking. Over the years these powers have been successfully used to tackle some of the traffic and parking related problems being experienced in and around Forest car parks. There may be the opportunity to work in partnership to tackle at least some of the problems. However there will be limitations including the ability to make Orders covering Crown Lands. Also signing and/or lining requirements for parking restrictions etc may be considered as unacceptable in the National Park due to their adverse visual impact. The extent of these limitations will need to be examined in detail along with the possible alternatives.

- F 4 - To co-ordinate traffic management/regulation and parking enforcement throughout the District through the retention of traffic management agreements with Hampshire County Council.

With the exception of off-street public car parks the District Council derives most of its traffic management powers through agency arrangements it has with HCC. Senior HCC officers have stated publicly that the current arrangements work "extremely well". HCC have indicated that they will be reviewing these agency arrangements. Under the current arrangements NFDC:

- *is the first point of contact for traffic management issues*
- *operates decriminalised car parking enforcement*
- *investigates suggestions for TROs and measures*
- *progresses and implements agreed TROs and "significant" measures (programme agreed in consultation with HCC)*
- *makes most temporary road closures (NFDC makes some road closures for special events using its own powers)*
- *promotes local partnership working through local meetings with HCC & NFDC Members, Town/Parish Councils, Police and appropriate officers to deal with identified issues.*

Arrangements for on-street charging will need to be agreed with HCC.

The District Council is keen to retain the agency agreements that allow an integrated parking and traffic management service to operate especially the ability to both implement and enforce parking restrictions on and off street. It is hoped that there will be an opportunity to also integrate the maintenance of signs and road markings necessary to have enforceable parking restrictions.

- F 5 - To work in partnership with town and parish councils, the National Park Authority, HCC, Police, Forestry Commission and others to address traffic management problems affecting local communities and the National Park area generally.

The continuation of close working partnerships with town and parish councils and others in areas where there are significant problems that can be addressed by traffic management is considered to be the best way of introducing effective measures.

- Aim G -** To have parking standards for new development that take account of the characteristics of the area (excludes National Park).

Policies

- G 1 - To review the District Council's parking standards for new development taking into account:

- revised National and Regional Planning Guidance
- Hampshire County Council policy
- the characteristics of the District
- the availability of alternatives to the private car

for inclusion in the Local Development Framework.

The link between the availability of parking and the choice of travel mode (car, public transport) has influenced car parking standards for new development. In accordance with Government guidance HCC and NFDC has adopted current maximum car parking standards for new development (except if environmental or road safety implications justify minimum standards) as supplementary planning guidance. HCC has produced preliminary accessibility maps based on the model Government has supplied which show that, in terms of public transport and walking, many parts of the District that are not "accessible". Draft National Guidance (PPS3) and Regional Guidance heralds a more flexible approach that takes account of the local characteristics of the area which the District Council believes is essential. As a result of PPS3 (provided it is not significantly changed from the draft) it is hoped that it will be possible to permit at least some development with a larger

number of parking spaces than the current standards permit especially in those areas that are not “accessible”. However, maximum standards are likely to remain in new guidance which is a cause for concern.

Work on preparing revised parking standards will start once the final version of PPS3 has been published. The District Council is the Planning Authority responsible for the District excluding the National Park. The New Forest National Park Authority (NPA) is planning authority for the National Park area. These standards will need to be included in each planning authority’s Local Development Framework (LDF) and their preparation and adoption is covered by legislation and statutory regulation. The District Council is supportive of partnership working with the NPA and it may be possible to agree parking standards that are acceptable to both planning authorities.

It should be noted that the documents which make up the LDF are likely to undergo a process of examination in public. Any significant departure from national or regional policies may be difficult to justify to the presiding Planning Inspector as part of this process. A “Car Parking Standards Review” has been undertaken by District Council officers for the District’s Economy and Planning Review Panel. This review was considered by the Panel on 21 June 2006 – [newforest.gov.uk/committeedocs/eprp/CDR01744.p df](http://newforest.gov.uk/committeedocs/eprp/CDR01744.pdf) (Report) and [newforest.gov.uk/committeedocs/eprp/CDM01839. pdf](http://newforest.gov.uk/committeedocs/eprp/CDM01839.pdf) (Minutes). Referring to the minutes, it is hoped that the preparation of Supplementary Planning Document in relation to parking standards which applies the maximum flexibility allowed under the new guidance (PPS3) will be included in the Policy Team’s work Programme. Work on this is dependant on the Government publishing the final version of PPS3.

Aim H - To set and review on and off street parking charges that are compatible with other strategy aims.

Policies

H 1 - To regularly review the charges for on and off street parking with the aim of:

- Influencing supply and demand for spaces
- Influencing demand as between charged on-street parking and off-street parking
- Influencing the length of stay and parking turnover
- Meeting the costs associated with decriminalised parking enforcement, transport/traffic/street management and CCTV related services and projects
- Complying with Local Authority Circular 1/95 (Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Outside London)
- Having a significant degree of local acceptability

It is anticipated that the use of the short stay shoppers parking clock and charges for non-clock users will be extended from public off-street car parks to on-street parking. The current off-street parking clock scheme has HCC consent up until the end of December 2007 and authorisation from HCC will need to be sought for its retention. The options for on-street charges are due to be considered during 2006/07. On-street charges will require HCC's consent. Given the area's dependence on the private car (associated with the lack of alternatives) the charges need to be set so that they do not have an adverse impact on the local economy. Local authority circular 1/95 (Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Outside London) recommends that on street charges should not be used "as a means of raising additional revenue". Having regard to this guidance HCC suggest that any on street charging scheme should aim to be self-financing.

NFDC GUIDELINES FOR ON-STREET RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES
(DRAFT 25 AUG 2006)

The procedure for consideration of requests for a scheme is based on Hampshire County Council's (HCC) draft policy. All schemes need to be acceptable to both HCC and New Forest District Council (NFDC). The assessment procedure should normally be as follows:-

- (1) Assess the need for residents parking by reference to HCC guidelines relating to existing parking in the street and availability of alternative parking;
- (2) Assess the practicability of a scheme, the type of scheme which would be appropriate and its acceptability in terms of effect on other streets, the proposed fee for a permit and whether visitors permits are necessary;
- (3) Carry out consultations on all aspects of the scheme to ensure the fullest possible understanding and agreement before formal advertisement of an order.

The type of scheme may vary but, referring to 2 (iv) below existing on street residents parking schemes within the District include the following elements:

- (a) the cost of implementing the scheme is met by the County Council
- (b) the cost of operating and enforcing the scheme is met by the District Council with residents paying for permits (currently £25 per permit per year with annual inflation increase).
- (c) number of permits generally two per property (in connection with this scheme taken as a residential property that is separately liable for the payment Council tax). Residents living in a property with no off street parking will normally be eligible for two permits, one of which may be a visitor's permit. Residents living in a property with off street parking will normally be eligible for one permit which may be a visitor's permit. For properties that are dwellings of multiple occupation with no off street parking consideration will be given to allowing two visitors permits. It should be accepted that having a permit will not guarantee an on street space. Residents' preferences for different arrangements will be considered but the ratio of properties to the amount of available parking will be a key factor.
- (d) scheme based on participating residents (concession not usually given to commercial or business premises) having exemption from "limited waiting restrictions". Thus participating residents have the opportunity to park for longer periods near their homes provided spaces are available. Shoppers, employees etc. can park subject to "length of stay" restrictions and availability of spaces.

The following additional points need to be borne in mind:

- (e) if there are no existing “limited waiting restrictions” then these will need to be introduced. In addition, “no waiting at any time” or “working day waiting restrictions” will be considered at the same time so as to minimise displacing parking to locations where it could be detrimental to road safety or cause environmental problems.
- (f) The District is considering options for the introduction of charging for on street parking. Residents parking schemes in areas that have potential for on-street charging will be deferred until the District has agreed its policy for the introduction of charging for on street parking.
- (g) Referring to 3 (i) below the Council will consider the proposals acceptable to the greater proportion of the residents if the number of those who support the proposals exceeds the number who do not and there is a good response rate (at least 50%).
- (h) The following are guidelines. There will not be a departure from the general principles. However they will be applied having regard to local circumstances, especially if the criteria are not met by only a small margin.

(1) ASSESSMENT OF NEED

- (i) “That not less than 85% of the available kerb space be occupied for more than six hours on a typical weekday”.

This guideline gives a good indication of the need in terms of the occupation of available kerb space and is readily assessed by a parking survey.

- (ii) “That not more than 50% of the residents have parking readily available within the curtilage of their property or allocated to that property in the form of private garages or other parking space.”

If the majority of residents do have their own private off street parking facilities then resident’s permits should not be necessary.

- (iii) “Schemes shall not be considered where residents have the ability to provide, at reasonable cost to themselves, parking within their own curtilage”.

(2) DETERMINATION OF FEASIBILITY AND TYPE OF SCHEME

- (i) “That the peak or normal working day demand for residents’ spaces can be met”.

This guideline is the essential step in assessment of the feasibility of a scheme and includes consideration of whether parked vehicles are acceptable in the particular street.

An analysis of the parking survey and a review of the surrounding area will show the demand for residents spaces, the character of the other parking which takes place, for example, whether commuters or shoppers are involved and will indicate the type of proposal which will be appropriate in the particular circumstances, i.e. whether a scheme involving spaces for residents only or a limited waiting order with exemption for residents from the time limit would operate satisfactorily. The needs of visitors should also be considered at this stage, whether alternative parking is available for them or whether they should be catered for by the issue of visitors' permits.

- (ii) "That the Enforcing Authority (New Forest District Council) is satisfied that a reasonable level of enforcement of the proposals can be maintained".

Consultation with the District Council's Parking Office would, of course, be required at an early stage and experience of the experimental scheme in Romsey did show that enforcement was required for effective operation of the order. The Police would also be consulted.

- (iii) "It must be shown that the introduction of the scheme will not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads, and particularly careful consideration should be given to the impact of a scheme in a conservation area. If appropriate, the scheme should be extended to include other roads within the vicinity".

It is important not merely to transfer the problem elsewhere. It may be necessary at this stage to widen the potential area covered by an order and consider a possible package of measures to give comprehensive area treatment.

- (iv) "That the cost of implementing, operating and enforcing a Residents Parking Scheme is met either:-

- (a) by the District Council
- (b) by the County Council
- (c) by the residents
- or
- (d) that the cost of implementing is met by the County Council and the cost of operating and enforcing the scheme is met by the District Council or residents".

This guideline gives a wide range of financial alternatives, although normally the County Council could expect the costs to be borne by the residents or District Council concerned.

(3) CONSULTATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

- (i) "That the proposals are acceptable to the greater proportion of the residents prior to formal advertisement."

An extensive consultation exercise will be required to advise residents of the detailed proposals including costs of permits and this guideline ensures that the County Council and District Council are conversant

with the wishes of the majority of residents, thus avoiding as far as possible abortive advertising costs for the traffic order. This may result in modification to the proposals, or abandonment if no satisfy

Following this stage the scheme, if promoted by NFDC, would be submitted to the HCC's Director of Environment and the local HCC and NFDC Members for approval prior to advertisement. Any objections would be considered by the District Council before implementation.

TYPES OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

TROS MADE UNDER ROAD TRAFFIC ACTS - All covered by HCC's agency agreement with NFDC.

Temporary Restrictions or Prohibitions (most commonly road closures)

Grounds for making temporary Notices and/or temporary Orders:

- Works on or near the road
- Likelihood of danger to the public or serious damage to the road
- Litter clearing and cleaning.

By Notice –Used if restriction or prohibition needs to come into force without delay. Normally in force for 5 days maximum but can be in force for a maximum of 21 days if there is a likelihood of danger to the public or serious damage to the road.

By Order – Used for planned works etc or if a temporary Notice needs to be extended

Experimental TROs - Used to bring a restriction or prohibition into effect for a limited period of time (up to 18 months) so that its effect can be assessed. Restriction or prohibition can be removed without delay if necessary. The making of an experimental order is advertised and all objections received within 6 months of the experimental order being made have to be considered before it can be made permanent. If it is not made permanent it lapses. Cannot be used for all types of measure, for example cannot be used for creating on-street parking bays including limited waiting restrictions or disabled parking bays.

Permanent TROs- Used to bring a restriction or prohibition into effect. Proposals have to be advertised and all objections have to be considered before an Order can be made.

TOWN POLICE CLAUSES ACT ROAD CLOSURES

NFDC has powers to make Orders allowing roads to be closed for special occasions.

Grounds for Order: The streets are thronged or liable to be obstructed due to public processions, rejoicing, illuminations or special events (but not for recurrent day to day conditions).

NFDC Citizen's Survey Results for Traffic Management

- Extracts from Survey Undertaken September 2006

Full results at newforest.gov.uk/citizenspanel

Traffic priorities (in priority order):

1. Reduce road casualties (85% said 'high' priority)
2. Minimise congestion (56% said 'high' priority)
3. Improve environment/quality of life through traffic management measures such as lorry restrictions (51% said 'high' priority)
4. Provide more parking in town and village centres (19% said 'high' priority with Lymington being the town most in need) – see also below.

90% said that it was important or very important that 'accident hot spots' should be dealt with in order of priority taking into consideration the number and severity of road casualties.

Speed limits

90% panel members said that speed limits do help to reduce the severity of personal injury accidents. 83% thought that speed limits help to reduce the number of accidents.

62% of those who speed (even if just on occasion) said that more enforcement would encourage them to comply with speed limits.

41% said 'more publicity and education campaigns' would encourage them to comply with speed limits.

The Panel felt that flashing boards (speed indicator devices) indicating actual speed if over the limit and more realistic/reasonable speed limits would also encourage compliance with speed limits.

Nearly all (92%) of the panel thought it was a high priority to encourage people to drive below the speed limits near schools.

85% thought it was a high priority in areas where there are 'accident hot spots'.

Over half (56%) thought it was a high priority where average speeds are well above the speed limit.

Parking

Provision of more parking:

19% said that more parking was a 'high' priority' when compared with other traffic management priorities. The Panel felt that Lymington was the town most in need of more parking.

44% of the panel thought providing more parking generally was a low priority or no priority at all when compared with other traffic priorities.

Ease of parking:

60% of respondents found parking in the centre of the three New Forest towns/villages they visit most often either very easy or easy. 13% found it hard or very hard.

Things that are important when parking (in priority order):

- 1 – Convenience in relation to destination
- 2 – Safety of self and vehicle
- 3 – Cost
- 4 – Quality/environment of location in which the vehicle is to be parked

Parking near schools:

83% felt that more stringent restrictions should be introduced to discourage vehicles parking or stopping near schools. The most popular measure (43%) was the introduction of restrictions *very close* to school entrances to prevent stopping even for a short time. Restrictions *near* schools a little less popular (27%-30%).

Restrictions to reduce congestion:

73% agreed that waiting restrictions on main traffic routes should be introduced to prevent parked cars causing traffic queues behind them. 3% disagreed.

Main traffic routes where waiting restrictions suggested (roads/areas mentioned the most):

Lymington/Lymington High Street (mentioned 34 times)
Ringwood High Street (mentioned 34 times)
Lyndhurst/Lyndhurst High Street (mentioned 21 times)
Ringwood Road, Totton (mentioned 18 times)
Outside schools (mentioned 14 times)
All high streets (towns and villages) (mentioned 13 times)
Fordingbridge High Street (mentioned 11 times)
A337 (mentioned 10 times)
New Milton/New Milton High Street (mentioned nine times)
Water Lane, Totton (mentioned nine times)
Jones Lane, Hythe (mentioned 8 times)

Southampton Road, Lymington (mentioned eight times)
All main roads (mentioned seven times)
Rumbridge Street, Totton (mentioned seven times)
St Thomas Street, Lymington (mentioned seven times)
Brockenhurst (mentioned five times)
Brookley Road, Brockenhurst (mentioned five times)
Gosport Street, Lymington (mentioned five times)

Cycling

66% agreed that people should be encouraged to cycle. 5% disagreed.

The most popular measures that would encourage cycling were:

- Cycle routes and cycle lanes in towns and villages (69%)
- Cycle routes and cycle lanes between towns and villages (70%)
- Cycle routes and cycle lanes in National Park (24%)
- Cycle parking in towns and villages (30%)

13% felt that local councils are doing enough to encourage people to cycle. 55% said more should be done and 3% said too much being done.

The following deterred respondents from cycling (top 4):

- Safety concerns (68%)
- Adverse weather (50%)
- Inadequate cycle routes (48%)
- Most journeys too long to cycle (37%)

66% have not heard of the New Forest Strategic Cycle Route Network.

COMMENTS FROM CONSULTEES

Hampshire County Council

The Director of Environment asked for the respective functions of the two Councils to be further clarified and to note that its consistency with HCC traffic management policy will need to be maintained over time.

Officer Comment: *A number of minor amendments have, in consultation with HCC, been made to address these points.*

Further comments from Hampshire County Council, Environment Department

The comments below refer to section 8 Strategy Policies. There are no fundamental changes suggested for sections 1 – 7.

1. Paragraph 6.1, pg 9 – should refer to parking control as well as traffic management measures.
2. A1, pg 11 – rather than ‘maximise’ off street parking, it might be better to say ‘balance’ or ‘optimise’. Maximise might imply the creation of parking which would be incompatible with other policy objectives.
3. A2, pg 11 – the parking clock does not have long term or permanent authorisation from the Highway Authority (currently has consent up until the end of December 2007) hants.gov.uk/decisions/decisions-docs/051011-exmrnh-R1014135256.html. This needs to be reflected here and elsewhere in the document with a reminder about the review process.
4. B1, pg 12 - make reference to the fact that the County Council’s Safety Engineering Team deal with locations with worst accident records.
5. B1, pg 12 – instead of ‘unless there are unacceptable conflicts with other strategy objectives’, it would be preferable to say ‘having regard to other priority objectives’.
6. C1, pg 13 – mention that proposals on ‘County Interest’ roads would be subject to normal procedures.
7. D1, pg 13 – Bus lanes are a reserved matter and would therefore be referred to the Highway Authority under the normal procedure.
8. D2, pg 13 – refer to your charging regime in this paragraph as this is probably the only way to influence commuting behaviour.
9. E1, pg 13 – subject to normal procedures. Proposals to limit the use of unsuitable roads by HGVs would be ‘promoted’ by NFDC and referred to the Highway Authority, who would then consider whether NFDC or HCC should deal with the matter.
10. E3, pg 14 – You may wish to consider whether NFDC really wants to commit to ‘access markings’ provided free of charge on request.
11. G1, pg 16 – Add a bullet point to refer to Hampshire County Council policy
12. H1, pg 17 – The first bullet point would better read ‘influence’ rather than balance. On-street charges would also be subject to Highway Authority consent. The bullet point referring to ‘revenue generation’ should be amended to reflect local authority circular 1/95 (Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Outside London) where guidance recommends that charges should not be used “as a means of raising additional revenue”. It might be better to say that the charging scheme put in place should ‘ensure that it is self-financing’.
13. H1, pg 18 – It is recommended that the final paragraph is deleted.

Officer Comment:

1. Accepted, 6.1 amended
2. a report considered by Cabinet on 7 September 2005 175.1.100.13/committeedocs/cab/CDR00790.pdf included the following:

There appear to be three key objectives in considering amendments to the scheme. They are:

- To maintain the financial viability of our Town/Village Centres.
- Encourage a turnover of vehicles in our car parks and provide as many parking opportunities as possible.
- Set charges and regulations, for long stay parking that will encourage individuals to consider not using their own cars for commuting, but, at the same time, not be overburdening on those who have no choice but to travel by car.

In light of both the above and HCC's comment Policy A1 has been amended as suggested by HCC ("maximise" changed to "optimise")

3. Paragraph 3.13, Policy A2 and text below H1 amended.
4. Policy B1 amended.
5. Policy B1 amended.
6. Text below C1 amended.
7. Text below D1 amended.
8. Text below D2 amended.
9. Text below E1 amended.
10. The greater discretion implied by HCC's comments is welcomed. Text below E3 amended.
11. Policy G1 amended.
12. Policy H1 amended and text below amended.
13. Text below H1 amended to reflect HCC's comments relating to circular 1/95 and ensuring charging scheme is self financing. HCC have clarified that their comment relates to on street charges and does not apply to off-street charges.

Police

Sergeant Skinner, Roads Policing Unit

I have read through the attached.

I have no additional points to raise.

Thank you.

Officer Comment: *Noted*

Inspector Roger Price, Roads Policing Unit

I have read the draft and am content thanks.

Officer Comment: *Noted*

National Park Authority

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Council's Draft Traffic Management Strategy. Having already involved the Authority's officers during preparation of the Strategy our comments are limited.

1. In relation to Strategy Policy E6, 'a realistic assessment of the traffic management and related benefits of new signs' is important, but might it also be appropriate to say something about monitoring their effectiveness after

installation? I am sure that this happens, but the thinking behind the County Council's removal of sign clutter initiative must be that some signs no longer effectively serve the purpose for which they were erected?

2. We still have an underlying concern that the general policy aspiration expressed in 5.3.2, to encourage a turnover of vehicles in car parks, could result in drivers being encouraged to move back on to the road network when, under certain circumstances, we would wish to be encouraging motorists to make a modal shift – to leave their car and continue by other means, such as on foot, on bikes or on public transport. We appreciate the difficulties of balancing all the different elements of car parking policy and understand that parking charges are now set to contribute to meeting all the strategy objectives outlined in Sections 5 and 7. We trust that the Council will ensure that parking controls still make provision for motorists who could be attracted to taking advantage of switching to other modes, such as the New Forest Tour bus initiative.
3. The Strategy understandably focuses on parking arrangements within towns and villages, though mention is made of harmonising on and off street amenity parking charges under E4. It would be helpful to know whether, and when, the Council is next likely to review its amenity (coast and countryside) parking provision.
4. The National Park Authority welcomes the opportunity to become an active partner not only in relation to coordinated traffic management and regulation (Aim F) but also wherever appropriate in achieving the other Strategy Aims.

Officer Comment:

1. *The scope of HCC's sign clutter initiative is not known at this time. The effectiveness of road casualty reduction measures can be judged by recorded injury accident information. Assessment of measures introduced to reduce the risk of recorded injury accidents where there are currently none is more difficult given the reasonable assumption that the measures will not result in more recorded injury accidents. The text below Policy E6 has been amended in response to these comments.*
2. *Encouraging modal shift is a shared objective. However given the lack of viable alternatives the Strategy needs to attempt to strike a reasonable balance between parking provision and encouraging modal shift. The District Council has provided financial support for the New Forest Tour. It hopes that the new arrangements will be a success and that in future years the Tour will become less dependant on subsidies.*
3. *There are no current proposals for reviewing amenity parking provision.*
4. *The Council is keen to work in partnership with the National Park Authority Policy F5 added to make this clearer.*

NFDC Councillors

Cllr Roger Neath

Thank you for your comprehensive draft.

Since moving to Lymington, I have noted that side road parking during daytime has increased, following the introduction of Long Stay charges. However, there seems to be an exodus of residents who park on street, from 8:00 am / 10:00 am. These spaces are filled by local business people until 5:00 pm / 6:00 pm.

By this time, the residents are returning, and can usually park outside, or very nearly outside their homes.

Parking on yellow lines in Lymington High Street is at its worst between 4.00 pm and 6.00 pm. Is this because the Wardens have finished their shift?

Of more serious concern, now that I travel most days to Lyndhurst, is the tailback of traffic on the A337, entering from the south. In the last week, it has taken me 15 to 20 minutes to reach Lyndhurst from Lymington. It has taken me 30 minutes to enter Lyndhurst, get up Shrubs Hill and on to ATC. Both times this was during the Lunch Hour.

When the A35 was closed, and the full volume of traffic was on the A337, the traffic moved smoothly up Shrubs Hill, with no delays. We need to give urgent attention to schemes in the pipeline for this route.

Officer Comment:

Comments about on-street parking by both residents and non-residents noted.

The Council's Parking Manager has been asked to respond to Cllr Neath on the issues associated with the enforcement of waiting restrictions.

HCC are considering the practicalities of measures to address congestion in and around Lyndhurst. This topic was discussed in detail at the Transport Seminar "The New Forest Transport Network" arranged by HCC in April 2006. The problems in and around Lyndhurst are noted but their resolution requires more than traffic management measures.

Town and Parish Councils

Bransgore Parish Council

- a) We have areas of inappropriate parking in the village as the parking facilities within the curtilage of people's homes do not meet the need. The bus service does not meet the transport need so cars are used.
- b) On street parking charges are not appropriate in villages, in our opinion.
- c) We did a survey a few years ago when the consensus was to have double yellow lines in parts of the village centre. This was not pursued as it could not be "policed". Perhaps at some future date this could be resurrected. Could you please advise if, how and when we could proceed with double yellow lines.
- d) We have problems with inappropriate use of the disabled bay in the village.

Mrs Sally Owen, Vice Chairman

Officer Comment:

- a) *Accepted that the limited amount of public transport etc. means that cars need to be used for many journeys. As regards areas of inappropriate parking, District officers would be please to discuss the possible introduction of waiting restrictions. It is acknowledged that parking facilities within the curtilage of people's homes does not meet the need and NFDC plans to review its parking standards, Policy G1 refers. However as Bransgore is in the National Park it is up to the National Park Authority to review the parking standards for development within its area.*

- b) *Bransgore Parish Council's view is noted. The text below Policy H1 refers. No decision on the introduction of on-street parking charges has been taken yet.*
- c) *As indicated in (a) above District officers would be please to discuss the possible introduction of waiting restrictions. Contact will be made with the Clerk to the Parish Council.*
- d) *The disabled bay in Betsy Lane is legally enforceable and NFDC's Parking Manager will be made aware of the Parish Council's concern. However the scale of enforcement is influenced by the amount of non compliance of restrictions which is low compared with other settlements which have more restrictions.*

Brockenhurst Parish Council

We have not discussed this in full council due to the summer recess but we emailed it round for comment. This is the general gist of the responses received:

- 1) Although this is a traffic plan, not a transport plan, it makes little / no provision for the encouragement of alternative traffic in towns and villages e.g. encouragement of cycling by provision of adequate road space for cyclists and the provision of bike parks, or managing deliveries to commercial premises.
- 2) The restriction of parking on the highway could lead to a disastrous loss of amenity as more people will seek to build car parking places on front gardens or park on verges.

Hope this is helpful.

Officer Comment:

- 1) *The provision of "alternative" road space, e.g. for cyclists, would normally be achieved through a capital programme schemes. That said can be less expensive traffic management measures that improve conditions for cyclists and also pedestrians. An additional policy (D3) will be added to reflect this. Measures such as loading restrictions will be introduced to help manage deliveries in order to meet aims such as improving road safety minimising congestion and improving the environment (Policies that refer include B1, B2, C1 & E1).*
- 2) *This concern is readily acknowledged, Policy A3 is of particular relevance.*

Hale Parish Council

Hale Parish Council makes the following comments on the strategy, but most of the points do relate to the Fordingbridge area of the District.

- a) On a whole parking in Fordingbridge is working well with the use of clocks and the payment meters. It is necessary from time to time that a traffic warden is present to ensure that the rules are adhered to.

- b) HGV lorries should be discouraged from the Forest “B” roads, except for access. In this area HGVs should be made to use the A36 and the A338 to get to and from Salisbury.
- c) From Hale there is only a bus service to Salisbury and not to Fordingbridge, Romsey or Southampton. It would not appear to be economically viable to lay on services for commuters to the other towns/cities. Unfortunately private vehicles are the norm in the north part of the Forest, making bus routes unprofitable, as has been proved by the CANGO service. We are very fortunate in the area to have a voluntary service call Downton Link, which takes people who do not have transport to the doctor, hospital etc.

Officer Comment:

- a) *Noted. It is accepted that enforcement is required to ensure that the rules are adhered to.*
- b) *Concerns about HGVs using inappropriate Forest roads accepted. Policy E1 refers. NFDC supports the recently proposed lorry restrictions for a number of Forest “B” roads north of the A31 that will require more lorries to use the A36 and/or the A338 to get to and from Salisbury.*
- c) *Accepted that the lack of public transport etc. means that private vehicles will remain the norm for most people living away from the main X3 service (runs up the A338). The Policies in the strategy reflect this and the text below Policies A1, A2 and D2 refers.*

Hordle Parish Council

After consideration at a recent Council Planning & Environment meeting, Hordle Parish Council’s comments on the document:-

“We agree with the vision and strategy set out in the draft document”.

Officer Comment:

Comments noted.

Hythe and Dibden Parish Council

The Council has considered the issues before and have made the following comments:

- a) The current parking standards as set out in the Planning Policies do not match the reality of the number of vehicles per household resulting from children staying at the parental home longer so care needs to be exercised in the arrangements for on street parking provision.
- b) When setting up residential on street parking arrangements consideration should be given to ensuring that existing adhoc parking e.g. Jones lane is not forced into other residential areas.

- c) Any restriction in parking on the highway could lead to further damage to amenity areas. Already we have considerable parking problems with vehicles being parked on verges and open spaces examples can be found on Hollybank, Netley view and Langdown estates. Parking on large open space such as The Green, Heatherstone Avenue needs addressing with possible use of dragon teeth or something similar.
- d) Whilst understanding the need to ensure turnover in the car parks. The current limit of three hours is causing the part time workers (say 4 hours per day) of local businesses to park other than in the car parks.
- e) Improvements to transport interchange at the Pierhead needs to be progressed the size of the new buses along their frequency means they end up parking on the road rather than in the turn around area.

I hope these comments are useful however if you would like any more information please let me know.

Officer Comment:

- a) *Concerns about the current parking standards are accepted. Policy G1 refers. The management of on-street parking needs careful consideration, a number of Policies refer including A1, A3, A4, A6 and F5. Section 6 (Assessment of Traffic Management Proposals) is also relevant.*
- b) *Displacement of parking will normally be a consideration when parking restrictions etc. are introduced. However unrestricted parking on-street in residential areas is common and need not be prevented unless there are specific problems associated with it. Each proposal needs to be considered on its merits but the scale of any problems can be difficult to predict. It is prudent to review any changes and be prepared to take further action if required.*
- c) *Please see (a) above. Parking on amenity areas is a problem mainly due to increased demand for parking. Options to address the problem include those set out in Policy E7. On new development the problems can be minimised by careful design. NFDC document "Housing design, density and character" (Adopted April 2006) refers. The requests for dragon teeth etc. have been passed to Hampshire Highways.*
- d) *The text following Policies A1 and A2 refers. It is important for the vitality of shopping centres that customers are able to park. There will often be a need for employee parking it should not be to the detriment of customer parking. The current arrangements achieve a reasonably effective balance between the various parking demands. The off-street parking charges will be reviewed before the end of December 2006.*
- e) *The need for improvements to transport interchange at the Pierhead is accepted. However such improvements are outside the scope of the Traffic Management Strategy.*

Lymington Town Council

Members discussed the document at their meeting on 13 September 2006.

- 3.12 The survey of shoppers took place in January the most atypical month of the year. A similar survey should be taken in July at a peak time when a true and realistic picture of parking problems would be apparent.

The Town Council and the disabled were not surveyed.

The Chamber of Trade has long recognised the urgent need for more parking. Ten years ago, according to the local plan, Lymington was 90 spaces short, since then there has been considerable building in the High Street and St Thomas Street in the burgage plots and behind business frontages putting more pressure on public car parks streets for employee parking.

Waitrose has already informed their employees that when they move to the new site, they will not be allowed to park in the supermarket car park.

- 3.13 Boat trailer parking is an additional hazard especially in Stanley Road, Solent Avenue and Westfield Road. Parking should be restricted.
- 3.14 On-street loading is of course legitimate but loading bays are impractical as they are not adjacent to each business. It is difficult for pedestrians to cross in safety.
- 3.15 What extensions are planned for Cannon Street car park?
- 3.17 We are very aware of the visual impact of signs, lines and coloured surfacing in this historic town.
- 3.18 The cost of long stay parking has led to on-street parking in undesirable locations.
- 5.3.5 It is not clear how on-street charges would work. Parking meters in the High Street would be unacceptable as they would seriously affect the stationing of the stalls at the Charter Market and would be visually detrimental in a Conservation Area with many Listed Buildings.

Policy A2 Free parking at Lymington Town Hall benefits NFDC employees as they receive an £80 addition to their salary. It does not benefit the community:

- A) Loss of income from resident and visitor parking.
- B) Increases the amount of on-street parking Monday - Friday.
- C) Takes up space which could be used for coach parking. For many years a coach park had been asked for either in front of or behind the Town Hall. Because of its proximity to the National Park, Lymington expects even more visitors. Coaches will be deterred unless parking provision is improved.

Policy A5 Delivery vehicles regularly follow the sign at East Hill and attempt to reach the High Street via New Street, finding this impossible they cause congestion and environmental damage by turning at the Emsworth Road / Cannon Street junction or Brunswick Place. Signage at East Hill should be amended so lorries go down East Hill and along Gosport Street.

Strategy Aim 3 The narrowing of Queen Street, the High Street / Church Lane junction and the proposed changes in New Street add to congestion.

B2 Measures to reduce the risk to pedestrians in Lymington High Street should certainly be considered.

E2 Improved crossing facilities are urgently needed as there is only one official crossing (outside post office) HCC must take into account the Disability Discrimination Act.

E3 Residents parking schemes must not lead to additional on-street parking elsewhere.

E4 Parking on new developments had been so minimal and unrealistic that vehicles clog up estates and spill on to side roads. This will increase unless parking facilities on new-builds is increased.

The clock system should only be available to NFDC residents. Tourists should pay full fees. Parking wardens should be more rigorous e.g. camper vans should not be allowed to park overnight at Bath Road and Emsworth Road car parks.

E6 Sign clutter plus pinch points and coloured road surfaces are not always effective or necessary and can have an unsuitable environmental impact in a historic town.

F2 The wearing of illuminated collars by New Forest ponies should be compulsory and would help to reduce accidents.

F4 If NFDC and HCC are to instigate on street charging, Town Councillors should be consulted.

G1 Lymington is a dormitory town. If a traffic survey was carried out from 6am to 9am and again at 5pm on vehicles coming into and leaving the town, this would be apparent. There is a need for residents to own cars because of the cost and lack of public transport. Residents need cars for hospital visits to Bournemouth and Southampton. It is not fair to expect people to reduce car use when they do not have the availability of regular bus services which are accessible in cities.

NFDC should take advantage of the flexibility allowed in PPS3 and take into account the local characteristics of an area such as Lymington and Pennington.

Policy H1 All policies should have a significant degree of local acceptability. Improving transport related services and infra-structure is more important than revenue generation. If there are financial surpluses, how they are used should be agreed after consultation with Lymington and Pennington Town Council.

Cllr Mrs Elizabeth Lewis - Chair of Planning.

Officer Response:

- 3.12 *As the object of the survey was to seek shoppers' opinions the timing of the survey is less significant. It is accepted that doing the survey in January meant that residents were over represented as there were fewer tourists in the town than there would be in the summer. Policy 6 refers to the need to monitor the availability of parking. Provision of additional of street parking is outside the scope of a traffic management strategy. Employee parking, unless covered by for example a planning condition, is a matter for individual employers. Some employers seek to minimise problems for adjacent communities by providing employee parking (generally at no charge in this District). Residents parking schemes can be used to minimise the effect of high demand for non-residential parking within residential areas.*
- 3.13 *Issues like can be addressed by the application of the Strategy Policies through liaison meetings having regard to the assessment process (Section 6 of the Strategy refers).*
- 3.14 *Loading bays can help accommodate deliveries whilst reducing congestion especially in busy shopping streets. Objections to specific proposals will be carefully considered.*
- 3.15 *This query will be forwarded to NFDC's parking manager.*
- 3.17 *Noted*
- 3.18 *Waiting restriction can be used to minimise such problems. Please see 3.13 above.*
- 5.3.5 *A report on the options is to be prepared during 2006/7.*
- Policy A2 *Please see 3.12 above. Displaced employee parking could have a detrimental impact on adjacent areas. This Strategy does not seek to introduce workplace parking charges. The need for suitable coach parking is acknowledged but its provision is outside the scope of this strategy.*
- Policy A5 *See 3.13 above.*
- New Street *Such improvements are outside the scope of this strategy.*
- Policy B2 *Noted.*
- Policy E2 *See 3.13 above.*
- Policy E3 *It needs to be recognised that giving "priority" to residents where there are significant parking pressures is likely to result in the displacement of non-residential parking. Each proposal will be considered on its merits.*
- Policy E4 *Noted.*
- The Clock Scheme Approval to continue the scheme beyond 2007 is necessary. These comments have been forwarded to NFDC's parking manager.*
- Policy E6 *Noted.*
- Policy F2 *Suggestion outside the regulatory framework. NFDC continues to be supportive of the suggestion.*
- Policy F4 *See 5.3.5 above. Any proposals will be subject to at least the normal statutory consultation process. The Town Council's comments will be forwarded to NFDC's parking manager.*
- Policy G1 *Noted although Lymington is more accessible than many other parts of the District and the new hospital should reduce the need for long distance "medical" related journeys.*
- Policy H1 *Local authority circular 1/95 (Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Outside London) recommends that on-street charges should not be used "as a means of raising additional revenue". Having regard to this guidance HCC, who have to approve the arrangements, have suggested that any on-street charging scheme should aim to be self-financing. Income from off-street charges is already accounted for.*

Marchwood Parish Council

1. The document suggests that both residents and tourists will have to park in all parts of the district. Concern that this leads to more parking on and damage to verges.
2. Lack of clear advertising for parking clocks.
3. Limitation to 2 hours in shopping areas could be detrimental to businesses.
4. Consider that residents parking permits should be free.
5. Inadequate public transport network to provide alternative for travel to work.

Officer Comment:

1. *It is agreed that verge parking, especially if it damages the verge or raises road safety concerns, can be a serious issue. The Strategy does not encourage verge parking but sets out measures to deter verge parking, Policy E 7 and 3.18 refer.*
2. *Comments relating to the advertising for parking clocks will be forwarded to the Council's Parking Manager.*
3. *Proposals for limited waiting will be considered on a site by site basis in consultation with Local Members, the appropriate Town/Parish Council and others. The period of waiting can be varied to suit local circumstances and does not have to be 2 hours.*
4. *Most authorities charge for residents parking permits and it is felt appropriate that the Council continues to make a reasonable charge to offset the costs that it incurs for administering residents parking schemes.*
5. *The inadequacies of the public transport system are readily acknowledged. The Strategy's Aims and Policies take these into account.*

Milford-on-Sea Parish Council

Thank you for consulting with us on this subject. I have the following comments to make on a point by point basis:

- 2.2 We appreciate the difficulties in providing additional car parking spaces in town centres, however, the Local Plan says that Milford is short of suitable parking and this is more recently reflected by the public consultation (under the Market Town Healthcheck) currently being undertaken locally. We therefore ask that every effort continue to be made to help provide us with additional spaces.
- 2.6 We welcome any opportunity to work closely with you on the examples of private non-residential car parking schemes as listed.
- 3.2 We acknowledge that traffic is likely to grow at approx. 1% per annum.
- 3.3 We confirm that the four adverse impacts listed are those which concern our residents.
- 3.4 We agree that the needs of people with disabilities are important and would wish you to help us address these concerns in Milford parish.
- 3.6 We would add "and cyclists" afterchild pedestrians (to be uniform with Page 11 B2, where cyclists are included).

- 3.7 & 8 We acknowledge that traffic volumes will increase and likely result in increased congestion, and possibly reduce air quality. We would like an air quality survey conducted in the village centre. How do we go about getting this undertaken?
- 3.13 Our own experience is that on-street parking has increased.
- 3.14 We agree that for Milford village centre, consideration should be given for loading bays to assist local businesses.
- 3.17 A Traffic Order is, as you know, being considered for Keyhaven. Do you know whether the National Park is supportive of the proposals being looked at?
- 5.1 We support all eight priorities listed.
- 5.3.1-4 We support all these aspirations.
- 5.3.5 No view was expressed on the introduction of on street parking.
- 6.2 We support an assessment process for evaluating traffic management proposals.
7. We support the Aims A - G
- 8 A2 Support the need for local employee parking, however, this should be away from immediate shopping centre.
- 8 A3 Agree that availability of 'genuine' short-term parking close to local shops helps maintain their economic vitality and that in some situations, for safety, congestion, or environmental reasons, on-street parking may not be desirable.
8. A5 Agree that congestion and environmental damage is caused by traffic, especially lorries, so would support a review of how we might be able to deal with this problem in Milford village centre.
- 8 B2 Agree that consideration should be given to TRO's and measures that will significantly reduce the risk of pedestrians and cyclists, especially children being injured.
- 8 B4 Agree that management measures should not be introduced if it is only likely to transfer the problem somewhere else without any overall benefit.
- 8 D1 Agree that measures should be taken to assist bus drivers and users that make public transport more reliable and support tougher regulation by NFDC traffic wardens in dealing with illegal parking in bus lay-bys e.g. at Milford School.
- 8 E2 Agree that measures should be taken to improve crossing facilities for all pedestrians, not just those with disabilities

- 8 E3 Agree that residents should be assisted with parking/access problems and that free residential parking schemes should at least be investigated, especially where this will not adversely affect the viability of trade in the village centre.
- 8 E7 We support the use of 'dragon's teeth' where appropriate. What about replacing all those that we have lost over the recent years to the detriment of verges etc?
- 8 F4 We note all bullet points, especially the one that says that NFDC promotes local partnership working through local meetings with HCC, NFDC members, Town/Parish Councils, Police and appropriate officers to deal with identified issues.....we await your call!

Officer Comment:

The concerns about parking provision are noted. Traffic management measures are an option to encourage turnover in to meet demand for short stay parking. Officers will continue to explore the available options with the Parish Council and local HCC & NFDC Members.

2.6, 3.2, 3.3 & 3.4 Noted

3.6 Amended as suggested.

3.7 & 3.8 Advice will be given to the Parish

3.13 Noted

3.14 Officers will discuss at next local Member/Parish liaison meeting, see below.

3.17 Officers will inform Parish of all responses to the advertised proposals at or before the next local Member/Parish liaison meeting.

5.1, 5.3 1-4, 5.3.5, 6.2, 7 Noted

A2 Noted, any suggestions for additional limited waiting proposals can be discussed at next local Member/Parish liaison meeting.

A3, A5, B2 & D1 Noted

D1 Noted. Comments relating to enforcement will be forwarded to the Council's Parking Manager.

E2 Noted

E3 Officers are pleased to receive requests for residents parking schemes that are likely to meet the guidelines referred to in the Strategy.

E7 Noted. Reports of damaged or missing dragon's teeth should be reported to Hampshire Highways.

F4 The meetings referred to are arranged on a regular basis with the larger Town and Parish Councils. Meeting with other Parish Councils are arranged on an ad-hoc basis to deal with new or changed traffic management issues or to progress identified traffic management related proposals. It is anticipated that a meeting with Milford Parish Council will be held shortly to consider responses to a recently advertised proposal and other traffic management issues.

New Milton Town Council

This was considered by our F&GP Committee this week.

General comments were that it appeared "dis-jointed". The Committee noted the document but reserved the right to comment further at a later stage.

Officer Comment:

Comments noted. The layout of the document has been amended to make it easier to use.

Ringwood Town Council

A1 – support

A2 – support

(i) Request an analysis of ticket sales – have the charges changed the pattern of parking?

A3 – support

A4 – support

A5 – support

(ii) Note that a Signage Project Group has been established to look at the quality and effectiveness of signing in the town and make recommendations for improvements.

A6 – support

B1 – support

B2 – support

(iii) School travel plans will influence this policy. Need to monitor hot spots.

B3 – support

B4 – support

(iv) Any TROs should include a comprehensive analysis of consequences.

C1 – support

D1 – support

D2 – support

E1 – support

(v) There is concern about heavy traffic on B class roads, particularly Christchurch Road.

E2 – support

(vi) The Ringwood Walking & Cycling Working Group has identified several measures to improve access for people with disabilities.

E3 – support

(vii) Any proposed schemes should include an analysis of the consequences of displaced vehicles, should the scheme be implemented. Proposals need to be developed in consultation with town and parish councils to take all circumstances into consideration.

E4 – noted

E5 – support

E6 – support

(viii) Request that Ringwood be considered as a pilot town for the removal of unnecessary signs etc.

E7 – support

F1 – support

F2 – noted

F3 – noted

F4 – noted

G1 – support

(ix) The Council has responded to consultation on parking standards and a survey of affected areas has been carried out.

H1 – support

(x) Recommend that one additional policy is included to state that the District Council will develop a close working partnership with town and parish councils, and that town and parish councils will be consulted on any traffic management matters in their area.

(xi) There was also some concern that, although paragraph 2.1 referred to the overarching theme of “reduce, manage and invest”, there was no reference to this in the remainder of the document.

Officer Comment:

Support noted.

- (i) Analysis of ticket sales can be provided. NFDC officers will contact Deputy Clerk to find out what information is wanted. Ad-hoc observations indicate the charging regime that was introduced in January 2006 has changed the pattern of parking. Car park surveys are planned to find out current levels of occupancy, length of stay etc.*
- (ii) Noted that Signage Project Group has been established.*
- (iii) Regarding School travel plans, NFDC is keen to work with HCC’s School Travel Planning Team especially to deal with any problems identified in the School Travel Plan itself.*
- (iv) The consequences of TROs will be assessed as set out in Section 6 of the strategy. The scale of the assessment will be influenced by the potential impact of the proposal.*
- (v) Concerns about heavy traffic on B class roads, particularly Christchurch Road are noted. However, as set out under E1, lorries are essential for a community to function so a number of factors have to be considered before measures are progressed.*
- (vi) It is noted that the Ringwood Walking & Cycling Working Group has identified several measures to improve access for people with disabilities. HCC have already introduced a number of these as part of their capital programme. Further work is largely dependant on HCC capital programme funding.*
- (vii) Accepted that proposed residents parking schemes need to identify the consequences of displaced vehicles. However the needs of residents with no off-street parking will be a major consideration. The type of scheme referred to in Appendix 1 has proved successful in town centre locations. It is readily accepted that proposals need to be developed in consultation with town and parish councils.*
- (viii) It is believed that HCC has already identified Totton as the likely pilot for the removal of unnecessary signs etc.*
- (ix) The Town Council’s comments were taken into account by the Panel when they considered parking standards for new development.*
- (x) It is readily accepted that the District Council need to continue its close working partnership with town and parish councils. In particular, that town and parish councils will be consulted on any traffic management matters in their area. Policy F5 added to highlight this.*
- (xi) As regards “reduce, manage and invest”, it is not thought necessary to repeat this overarching theme elsewhere in the document. Traffic management generally focuses on “reduce and manage”. Significant transport investment will be secured through other means, for example, HCC’s capital programme.*

Totton & Eling Town Council

Comments on your TM Strategy to reinforce requirements for traffic management in Totton & Eling:

1. We welcome any policy or consideration that will assist in the control of parking around schools to provide a safer environment for children entering and exiting schools.
2. A reduction in on-street parking in and around the town centre will help improve its appearance but we accept that delivery provision is needed for businesses.
3. Does 5.3.4 sort of contradict the comments outlined previously for reducing on-street parking? Or have I mis-read this?
4. Suitable alternatives to using the car are lacking in the Totton and surrounding areas, especially now that bus services are scheduled to be reduced?
5. Car parking charges in Totton's town centre will have a detrimental effect on the town centre.
6. E1 – On-street parking charges may help to deter this type of parking and encourage people to use the free car parks available in Totton.
7. E2 – Fines should be imposed on non-disabled car users using a disabled parking bay. Not sure if this is enforceable by the County due to it not being Government policy.
8. Does NFDC Transport dept. get involved with residential parking issues through your TRO scheme? For example, where cars parking on verges are obstructing visibility for people exiting a side road?

Hope these comments are useful.

Officer Comment:

1. *NFDC is keen to work with HCC's School Travel Planning Team and community representatives to provide a safer environment round schools and a number of measures have been progressed in the District.*
2. *Noted*
- 3 & 4. *It is suggested a balance needs to be struck having regard for the limited availability of viable alternatives to the car in many parts of the District. The provision of parking is therefore essential but, through regulation and/or charges, it is hoped to encourage individuals to consider not using their own cars for commuting whilst not overburdening those who have no alternative.*
- 5 & 6. *Comments relating to charges noted. Policy H 1 refers to regularly reviewing the charges for off street parking.*

7. *Enforcement action can be taken if the disabled space is covered by a traffic regulation order (has a traffic sign). In residential areas informal disabled spaces (do not have a traffic sign) can be provided in accordance with a county wide draft policy but these are not legally enforceable.*
8. *This Council will consider issues such as parking obstructing visibility. Legally enforceable restrictions can be introduced where appropriate; policies B2, B4 and E7 refer*

Lymington Chamber of Commerce Response

Lymington Chamber of Commerce broadly understands and agrees with the document. However, we feel improvements or changes could be made to the following specific points:

- 2.3 This statement needs to be reworded. It is made perfectly clear throughout the rest of the document that 'maintaining the viability of town and village centres' is one of the main priorities of the Council's policy on Car Parking. This statement however suggests that this may not continue to be the case in the future. We would be very concerned if any aspect of this report gave this impression.

This is a statement of the background. Aim A makes it clear that 'maintaining the viability of town and village centres' is one of the main priorities of the Council's policy on Traffic Management of which Car Parking is a very important part.

- 3.14 We strongly support the statement to consider the need for loading bays for local businesses. It is vital for smaller businesses that they are able receive deliveries direct to their premises in town centre locations. Loading restrictions would damage smaller businesses as they would be unable to dictate to couriers specific delivery dates/times and if specific delivery times would increase the costs of their deliveries.

Noted

- 3.15 Further to discussions with NFDC, we understand that the planned works in Cannon Street, Lymington are now not going ahead. However we also are led to believe that there is a small fund available for future car park developments. Lymington Chamber would be interested in discussing future increases to car parking capacity in Lymington as we see this as a priority. We would be prepared to look at local businesses contributing to a fund if a specific proposal was deemed viable.

The Council will be pleased to continue discussions with the Chamber regarding parking provision in Lymington.

- 5.3.2. We understand the need to encourage a turnover of vehicles and provide as many parking opportunities as possible. However this needs to be balanced with allowing shoppers/visitors enough time in Short Stay parking to ensure that their visit is viable. For example the increase in the Short Stay from 2 hours to 3 hours has improved the situation for Lymington traders as customers now have enough time to explore the town and carry out their activities.

It is readily accepted that a balanced approach is needed. This is set out in Strategy including Policy A2.

- 5.3.4 We would support making more on-street car parking available as this could help staff of local businesses to find suitable car parking spaces thereby freeing up town centre off-street car parking spaces for visitors/shoppers. We would be interested in discussing which areas could be used to increase on-street car parking facilities.

The Council will be pleased to continue discussions with the Chamber regarding parking. On-street parking is becoming increasingly important as parking pressures increase. A balanced approach that addresses the parking needs of residents and those of employees who want/need to park in residential areas is set out in the Strategy.

- 5.3.5 The chamber has strong reservations about introducing on-street car parking charges in Lymington Town Centre. We feel that this could be seen as another barrier to attracting visitors to the town. We would like some commitment made in the document to a full consultation period with business organisations prior to the introduction of on street charges.

A report to the Economy and Planning Review Panel deals with the key issues associated with on-street charging, newforest.gov.uk/committeedocs/eprp/CDR02102.pdf . The report states that comprehensive consultations need to be undertaken with various interest groups and individuals.

The report refers to the following benefits of on-street charging:

** Improve waiting regulation compliance and create more parking opportunities.*

This will provide for more people to be able to park in key town centre locations.

** Make enforcement of regulations more effective.*

** Influence demand between on and off street parking.*

** Influence the length of stay and parking turnover.*

- 8.A5 It would be beneficial to include signage to car parks. We feel that signage/public knowledge of which car parks they can use and where they are located could be improved in Lymington.

It is acknowledged that improved signage and information about public car parks in Lymington is required. Officers will be progressing these.

- 8.F5 We would also like a commitment to working with local business organisations with regard to car parking and town centre traffic management. The views of the Chamber can often be different to other local organisations such as town council as the business community has other priorities and needs that are not always appreciated or understood by the Town Council. Given that maintaining the viability of town centres is a high priority for NFDC, a commitment to work with the local Chamber of Commerce should also be included.

The Council has developed closer links with the business community and is keen to continue the dialogue it has established with the Chamber.