

## RE-DESIGNATION OF NFDC-OWNED STREET LIGHTS AS HIGHWAY LIGHTING

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider whether or not the Council should agree to transfer some of its lights to Hampshire County Council by having them re-designated as highway lighting. Most street lights in Hampshire are maintained at HCC's expense.
- 1.2 Cabinet considered a report on this matter on 1 February 2006 ( [175.1.100.13/committeedocs/cab/CDR01370.pdf](http://175.1.100.13/committeedocs/cab/CDR01370.pdf) ) and Minute 100 refers ( [newforest.gov.uk/committeedocs/cab/CDM01420.pdf](http://newforest.gov.uk/committeedocs/cab/CDM01420.pdf) ). They asked that Economy & Planning review Panel consider any further technical reports and make recommendations back to Cabinet as appropriate. The resolutions made by Cabinet included:
- 1.2.4 *That NFDC officers should instigate discussions with HCC officers with the aim of identifying any NFDC owned lights that should be re-designated as Highway Lighting (for which HCC would then become responsible for).*
- 1.3 HCC have recently set out their interpretation of current legal situation (2.2 below refers) regarding the possible re-designation of NFDC owned street lighting (referred to as footway or public lighting) as highway lighting. This interpretation is accepted by NFDC officers but it is hoped that there can be some flexibility where appropriate.
- 1.4 It is suggested that lighting in the roads listed in Appendices 1 and 2 are re-designated as highway lighting.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In the 1970's HCC and NFDC officers decided which lights should be designated parts of highway lighting systems and which should be designated footway lighting. Since then additional development has taken place, additional lighting provided and, recently, more detailed information on lighting spacing/positions is available through geographical information systems (GIS).
- 2.2 Footway lights that satisfy **all** the following criteria can be re-designated as highway lighting:
- Lights must be at least 13 feet high but not more than 20 feet high
  - Must be part of a system of 3 or more street lights
  - Within that system of lighting, which HCC have said would normally be a complete road, the spacing between lights must be 50 yards or less.

- 2.3 NFDC owns approximately 4,600 street lights (footway lighting) in the District. Currently the District's street lights are included in Hampshire County Council's Maintenance of Street Lighting Contract and electricity procurement arrangements. For 2007/8 the approved budget for maintenance, electricity and planned maintenance (column replacement) was £255,570.
- 2.4 HCC are progressing a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) bid to the Department for Transport (DfT) to allow it to address the problems it has with its aging stock of highway lighting. For lights that remain designated as Footway lighting NFDC will continue to have a financial commitment. For NFDC lights included in any the PFI this commitment will last at least until the end of the 25 year PFI period. For NFDC lights not included in the PFI the financial commitment will be an indefinite one.
- 2.5 Lights that are re-designated now will become the responsibility of HCC. The District Council will have no future liability for their maintenance, electricity costs or replacement irrespective of whether or not the PFI bid is successful.

### **3. LIGHTS SUGGESTED FOR RE-DESIGNATION**

- 3.1 Members have been concerned that if and when HCC become responsible for any NFDC owed lighting their PFI Contractor may replace "decorative" lighting with standard lighting columns. HCC have considered this point as many decorative columns are currently HCC owned. HCC have given the assurance that where decorative lighting is already in place then the Contractor is required to replace like for like – i.e. bring it up to standard with decorative units. Most of the decorative lighting is relatively new imitations of older style lighting. However some of NFDC's lights are not recently made imitations of the old style lights but are the "genuine article".
- 3.2 To maintain the integrity of conservation areas it would normally be undesirable to replace the original units with new imitations (unless the originals were unsafe and repair was impractical). Also the replacement of existing lighting with more and/or taller columns within conservation areas to achieve the level of illumination HCC are seeking could be detrimental to the conservation area. The Portfolio Holder is of the view that, in Conservation Areas, the District should retain full control over district owned lighting. The list of roads in Appendices 1 and 2 do not include roads in conservation areas.
- 3.3 Most of the roads where re-designation of lighting is acceptable to HCC (listed in Appendix 1) are interspersed with roads where the lighting is already HCC owned. There are road and community safety benefits of a uniform level of lighting that meets current illumination standards. In addition, the District Council would not be responsible for the maintenance and replacement costs irrespective of the outcome of the PFI bid. As a rough guide, based on current budgets, this would save the District £42 per year for each light re-designated. In addition the light would need to be replaced when it became unserviceable. At presents costs (£800 per unit) and assuming a 40 year service life the equivalent annual cost will be in the in the region of £20 per unit. The current annual cost per light, including replacement, is therefore in the region of £62 per light. However as most of NFDC's lights are well through their service life replacement costs will peak in 5 -20 years time.

- 3.4 When Cabinet previously considered lighting issues in February 2006 it was agreed that:

*“..... NFDC proceeds on the basis that it seeks to include its street lights in the larger settlements (including Totton, Marchwood, Hythe, Dibden Purlieu, Holbury, Fawley, Blackfield, Lymington, Pennington, Hordle, Milford-on-Sea, Ashley, New Milton, Barton-on-Sea, Ringwood and Fordingbridge) in the PFI bid”*

On that basis it is suggested that lighting in these areas (referred to as “non-sensitive areas”), but excluding lighting in conservation areas, be transferred to HCC.

- 3.5 It is suggested that in other areas (referred to as “sensitive areas”) the character of the road is considered. In these sensitive areas not all the roads have a rural character, for example there are residential estate type developments within some larger Forest villages. There are also through roads where, for safety and/or “crime and disorder” reasons, it is desirable that the lighting be to a consistent highway lighting standard. On through routes where the lighting is already closely spaced (50 yards or less) there is normally little environmental benefit to the area of not re-designating these lights as highway lighting. Local Members have been consulted about the re-designation of lighting in sensitive areas within their ward and their comments are summarised elsewhere in this report. The lights suggested for re-designation takes account of their comments.
- 3.6 A detailed assessment of all the Council lights has been undertaken using information provided by HCC. Many of the lights do not meet the re-designation criteria set out above but a significant number could possibly meet the criteria. HCC officers have assessed these and have indicated that the lighting in the roads listed in Appendix 1 could be re-designated as HCC owned highway lighting (lighting in conservation areas excluded).
- 3.7 There are some additional lights outside conservation and sensitive areas that HCC will be asked to re-assess (Appendix 2 refers). In addition there are some roads predominantly lit with HCC owned lighting but with one or two NFDC owned street lights. The NFDC owned lighting in these roads will be added to Appendix 2. Appendix 1 will updated if HCC agree to any re-designate any of the lights listed in Appendix 2.

#### **4. LIGHTING IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES**

- 4.1 NFDC and HCC do under take lighting improvement schemes. The current NFDC works budget for this is £23,690 (roughly equivalent to 26 new lights). There is confusion as to which authority should be contacted when street lighting improvements are requested. HCC, as the responsible authority, have set out their “principles” for lighting provision ([hants.gov.uk/roads/highway-factsheets/street-lighting/lighting-policy/main-principles.htm](http://hants.gov.uk/roads/highway-factsheets/street-lighting/lighting-policy/main-principles.htm)). These are compatible with the District Council’s priorities for lighting improvements. The National Park Authority have highlighted the issue of night time pollution which is covered, as least in part, by HCC’s lighting policy. Throughout the County HCC funds, with additional contributions for Parish/District Councils, street lighting improvement schemes through its Community Safety initiative.

- 4.2 Given the above points and the fact that all lighting schemes on the highway have to be approved by HCC it is suggested that HCC are better placed to consider requests for lighting improvements on all adopted roads from the general public, town and parish councils etc. Funding is an issue for both HCC and NFDC. Given the prospect of lights being re-designated as highway lighting or possible included (and improved) in HCC's PFI arrangements it is suggested that lighting improvements on **adopted roads** should be deferred for the time being. Exceptions would be:
- 4.2.1 HCC led community safety initiative lighting schemes (a County wide programme) which demonstrably tackle identified community safety issues in non-sensitive areas. It is suggested that the District Council offer to contribute towards such schemes.
  - 4.2.2 Lighting improvements on roads or in areas where the lighting is unlikely to be improved as part of the PFI that which demonstrably tackle identified community safety issues in non-sensitive areas (list in Appendix 3 refers).

Any decision to progress or contribute towards the above lighting improvements will normally be taken by NFDC's Planning & Transportation Portfolio Holder.

- 4.3 Occasionally there are requests for lighting improvements for areas **not** maintained by HCC as part of the highway network. Provided use areas are classed as public areas where the public have uninterrupted access then NFDC are the appropriate authority to consider such requests. By definition road safety should not be an issue so it is suggested that priority be given to proposals that reduce crime and deter anti-social behaviour. The basis of assessment will be the "Caddie" website [hantsiowcaddie.gov.uk/caddie-2/portal/media-type/html/user/anon/page/default.psml/js\\_panename/MapLite/action/MapActionLite/eventssubmit\\_doextent/null/minx/403095.40/miny/92054/maxx/449322.20/maxy/123351.20/district/newforestdistrict](https://hantsiowcaddie.gov.uk/caddie-2/portal/media-type/html/user/anon/page/default.psml/js_panename/MapLite/action/MapActionLite/eventssubmit_doextent/null/minx/403095.40/miny/92054/maxx/449322.20/maxy/123351.20/district/newforestdistrict). Again any decision will normally be taken by NFDC's Planning & Transportation Portfolio Holder.

## 5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Any lighting that is transferred would have to be closely spaced so as to meet HCC's re-designation criteria. Therefore there is unlikely to be any short term environmental implications regarding re-designation. Most of the street lights in Hampshire are already owned by HCC and many are in sensitive areas. HCC's Street Lighting Policy [hants.gov.uk/roads/highways-policy/lighting.htm](https://hants.gov.uk/roads/highways-policy/lighting.htm) demonstrates that it takes its responsibilities seriously when it comes to the environmental issues.

- 5.2 NFDC’s Cabinet has already agreed “in principle” to seek the inclusion of District owned street lighting in non-sensitive areas. The higher standard of illumination that would occur as a result of the PFI in sensitive areas if the District’s (or HCC’s) lights were upgraded to “highway standard” could have an adverse environmental impact where the existing lighting is widely spaced. However the indications from HCC are that such lighting will be replaced under the PFI on a one for one basis. Under such circumstance there is unlikely to be any significant environmental implications regarding re-designation of lighting in sensitive areas.
- 5.3 Some of NFDC’s lights are of the type originally installed (e.g. cast iron columns). Especially when in conservation areas it may considered of special value to the area. By not re-designating lighting in conservation areas the character of conservation areas the District Council will be able to directly influence the level and appearance of current NFDC owned lighting in these areas. Separate work is being done on the assessment of lighting on Conservation areas in connection with HCC’s PFI. Whilst the suggested general principle is that lighting in conservation areas should not be re-designated there could be locations where, for example, higher columns will not have any negative environmental impact. In such locations re-designation will be considered in consultation with HCC and conservation area officers.

## 6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are clear and significant financial implications if District owned street lighting is re-designated as highway lighting. Most street lights in Hampshire are maintained at HCC’s expense. It can be argued that NFDC’s Council tax payers will be paying more for street lighting than elsewhere in the County if NFDC retain ownership of street lights that could be re-designated as HCC owned highway lighting.
- 6.2 The current annual cost of maintaining (including energy) an existing NFDC street light is approximately £42 per light per year. Allowing for replacement costs (only small element covered by existing budgets) this rises to £62 per light per year. Based on the number of lights included in Appendix 1 (410) the following table sets out the potential savings that could be achieved through re-designation. Given recent comments made by HCC officers it is unlikely that they will accept the re-designation of many of the lights listed in Appendix 2 so in the table below it is assumed that 10% of these lights (79) will be accepted by HCC.

### POTENTIAL ANNUAL SAVINGS DUE TO RE-DESIGNATION

Number of lights	Maintenance Costs (cover by existing budgets)	Replacement Costs (only small element covered by existing budgets)	Total Maintenance & Replacement costs
489	£20,538	£9,780	£30,318

- 6.3 In the short term, any saving will be reduced by the need to undertake assessments, negotiating alternative maintenance arrangements etc. associated with joining or not joining HCC’s PFI bid. A further report will be prepared on the PFI bid.

- 6.4 It is suggested that NFDC's current lighting improvement budget (£23,690 for 2007/8) is used to contribute or fund improvement as set out in Section 4 above. This will have no impact on existing budgets.

## **7. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 HCC led community safety initiative lighting schemes would have beneficial crime and disorder implications.
- 7.2 Within built up areas having a comprehensive system of highway lighting that meets current standards will have both road and community benefits. The re-designation of District owned street lights as highway lighting will contribute toward this objective.

## **8. CONSULTATIONS**

- 8.1 Local Members have been consulted about the re-designation of lighting in sensitive areas (list included in Appendix 3) within their ward and their comments are summarised in Appendix 3.
- 8.2 The Nation Park Authority. Their comments will be reported verbally.

## **9. CONCLUSIONS**

- 9.1 The re-designation of NFDC owned street lighting as highway lighting as set out above has financial benefits for this Council with minimal negative environmental impacts given:
- the assurances given by HCC
  - the general retention of all lighting in conservation areas
  - the retention of most lighting in "sensitive" areas.
- 9.2 HCC's PFI will result in better lighting in the roads where the lighting is re-designated. This will contribute to improved road and community safety.
- 9.3 To avoid duplication and waste the NFDC allocation for lighting improvements should focus on the priorities set out in Section 4 above.

## **10. PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S COMMENTS**

- 10.1 The Portfolio Holder agrees with the conclusions and recommendations set out in this report.

## **11. REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS**

- 11.1 The Planning and Transportation Review Panel at their meeting on 21 November 2007 supported the recommendations below.

## 12. RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 That the Cabinet be recommended to agree:-

- (i) That NFDC owned lighting in the roads listed in Appendix 1 re-designated as highway lighting and ownership be transferred to HCC on 1 April 2008 or as soon as possible thereafter.
- (ii) That further consideration be given to the re-designation of lighting in conservations areas following completion the assessment of the impact of lighting in conservation areas.
- (iii) That NFDC seeks HCC's agreement to getting the NFDC owned lighting in the roads listed in Appendix 2 re-designated as highway lighting and ownership be transferred to HCC.
- (iv) That improvements (other than proposals previously agreed by the Portfolio Holder) to NFDC owned lighting on adopted highways be deferred until the outcome of negotiations on PFI are known.
- (v) The focus of this Council's future lighting improvement programmes should be proposals that comply with HCC's lighting policy and are either:
  - HCC led community safety initiative lighting schemes (a County wide programme) which demonstrably tackle identified community safety issues in non-sensitive areas. The District Council offer to contribute towards such schemes provided that the Town/Parish Council makes a comparable contribution.
  - Lighting improvements on roads or in areas where the lighting is unlikely to be improved as part of the PFI which demonstrably tackle identified community safety issues in non-sensitive areas (list of sensitive areas included in Appendix 3)
  - Lighting improvements that help reduce crime and deter anti-social behaviour in public areas where the public have uninterrupted access but the area is **not** maintained by HCC as part of the highway network nor within a sensitive area.
- (vi) That HCC be asked to initially assess all requests for lighting improvements on adopted highways.

### For Further Information Please Contact:

Nick Hunt  
Principal Engineering (Transportation)  
Tel: 023 8028 5916  
E-mail: [nick.hunt@nfdc.gov.uk](mailto:nick.hunt@nfdc.gov.uk)  
Street Lighting Re-designation E&P rev2

### Background Papers:

Published papers  
E-mails in N Hunt's IT Microsoft Office System

**APPENDIX 1**

**NFDC LIGHTS SUGGESTED FOR RE-DESIGNATION THAT HCC WILLING TO ACCEPT**

<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	
FA	FAWLEY
FO	FORDINGBRIDGE
HO	HORDLE
HY	HYPHE
LP	LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON
LY	LYNDHURST
MA	MARCHWOOD
MF	MILFORD-ON-SEA
NM	NEW MILTON
RI	RINGWOOD
TE	TOTTON & ELING

**LIGHTS IN NON-SENSITIVE AREAS** (pl. see Appendix 3 for list of areas)

NO OF LIGHTS	LENGTH OF LINK	ROAD NAME	PARISH (pl see above for key)
8	258	FAWCETT ROAD	NM
7	261	VINCENT ROAD	NM
2	59	VINCENT CLOSE	NM
5	230	COMPTON ROAD	NM
4	122	ROBIN GROVE	NM
10	280	ELM AVENUE	NM
3	105	DAWKINS WAY	NM
4	155	BYRON ROAD	NM
6	220	MILLER CLOSE (LOOP)	NM
7	261	HERBERT ROAD	NM
10	276	LYON AVENUE	NM
6	279	KINGS ROAD	NM
5	139	LARKSHILL CLOSE	NM
20	455	PRIESTLANDS ROAD	LP
6	216	CLINTON ROAD	LP
3	105	TITHE BARN (LOOP)	LP
18	602	NORTH STREET	LP
13	345	BELMORE ROAD	LP
5	173	OLD FARM WALK	LP
5	78	VICTORIA PLACE	LP
4	170	FOOTPATH NO 5 (MARYATT ROAD TO JOWITT DRIVE)	NM
5	201	PICKET CLOSE (SPINE)	FO
2	62	PICKET CLOSE (SPUR)	FO
6	185	LOWER BARTONS	FO
5	225	ALEXANDRA ROAD	FO
5	85	LUMBY DRIVE (PART)	RI
3	93	POULNER PARK	RI
5	148	LINDEN GARDENS	RI



7	295	CALMORE GARDENS	TE
12	130	BUCKTHORN CLOSE	TE
7	239	SPICERS WAY	TE
4	132	PLAYERS CRESCENT (SUB LOOP)	TE
5	202	SUTTON ROAD	TE
7	246	HAWTHORNE ROAD	TE
5	174	BAGBER ROAD	TE
3	89	HUNTINGDON CLOSE (HEAD)	TE
5	216	COMPTON ROAD	TE
4	125	MILL ROAD	TE
9	394	THE DRIVE	TE
4	156	ROBERTS ROAD	TE
2	66	POWELL CRESCENT (SUB LOOP)	TE
2	86	ORCHARD CLOSE (SPINE)	TE
3	81	ORCHARD CLOSE (HEAD)	TE
4	173	MOONSCROSS AVENUE	TE
3	105	FISHERS ROAD (SOUTH)	TE
6	208	WATERSIDE	HY
10	356	WINDRUSH WAY	HY
3	93	ELGIN CLOSE (HEAD)	HY
8	234	BUTTS ASH GARDENS	HY
3	92	ASH CLOSE	HY
9	306	HAMPTON CLOSE	FA
4	166	ROMAN WAY (SPINE)	HY
3	62	ROMAN WAY (HEAD)	HY
8	335	LANEHAYS ROAD	HY
10	266	OVERBROOK	HY
5	238	THE MEAD	HY
3	108	MICHAELS WAY	HY
7	213	LATCHMORE DRIVE	HY
5	212	MANOR ROAD	FA
6	201	ASHLETT CLOSE	FA
3	116	WOODVILLE ROAD	FA
<b>361</b>		<b>NUMBER OF LIGHTS</b>	

**LIGHTS IN SENSITIVE AREAS** (pl. see Appendix 3 for list of areas)

NO OF LIGHTS	LENGTH OF LINK	ROAD NAME	PARISH (pl see above for key)
5	168	GARDEN CLOSE (SPINE)	LY
3	100	KINGS CLOSE	LY
3	134	PEMBERTON ROAD	LY
4	159	EMPRESS ROAD	LY
11	274	CEDAR MOUNT	LY
4	135	ASH ROAD	AC
7	218	HIGHWOOD ROAD	BK
12	495	CADLAND PARK (SPINE)	FA
49		<b>NUMBER OF LIGHTS</b>	

**APPENDIX 2**

**NFDC LIGHTS SUGGESTED FOR RE-DESIGNATION TO BE DISCUSSED WITH HCC**

**LIGHTS IN NON-SENSITIVE AREAS (pl. see Appendix 3 for list of areas)**

NO OF LIGHTS	LENGTH OF LINK	ROAD NAME	PARISH (pl see Appendix 1 for key)
15	561	MARLEY AVENUE	NM
14	585	KENNARD ROAD	NM
9	252	LEIGH ROAD	NM
2	95	CULVER ROAD	NM
9	396	ALBERT ROAD	NM
6	212	FURZE CROFT	NM
2	58	NORRIS GARDENS (HEAD)	NM
8	329	CLIFFE ROAD (SPINE)	NM
2	75	CLIFFE ROAD (SPUR)	NM
14	683	BARTON LANE	NM
15	620	CHILTERN DRIVE	NM
9	310	SOLENT DRIVE	NM
9	401	GAINSBOROUGH AVENUE (SPINE)	NM
6	228	BELMONT ROAD	NM
16	711	HIGH RIDGE CRESCENT (LOOP)	NM
5	218	STONELEIGH AVENUE	HO
2	29	HOLES CLOSE (HEAD)	HO
4	140	LARKSHILL CLOSE ( SPUR)	NM
3	101	WAINSFORD ROAD (SPUR)	LP
6	215	POUND ROAD (SPINE)	LP
9	387	LODGE ROAD (SPINE)	LP
9	191	WILLIAM ROAD	LP
2	81	JONATHAN CLOSE	LP
2	75	POWLETT ROAD	LP
1	496	LENTUNE WAY	LP
11	457	BITTERNE WAY	LP
3	76	FLUSHARDS	LP
1	47	SARACEN CLOSE	LP
20	992	SALISBURY ROAD (NORTHERN SECTION)	FO
33	1422	WATER LANE	TE
10	305	CHURCH LANE (PART)	FA
3	51	GRAVEL LANE (PART)	RI
3	104	GRAVEL LANE (SOUTH)	RI
3	121	TESTWOOD AVENUE	TE
4	161	ASHFORD CLOSE	FO
10	418	PARSONAGE PARK DRIVE	FO
4	185	THE BARTONS	FO
7	307	ALBION ROAD	FO
5	231	FORESTSIDE GARDENS (SPINE)	RI

2	96	FORESTSIDE GARDENS (NUMBERS 9-39 ODD)	RI
1	36	PARKSIDE (SW SPUR)	RI
3	128	COLLINS LANE	RI
2	71	GREEN LANE (PART)	RI
2	51	MANOR GARDENS	RI
2	139	ASHBY CRESCENT	TE
2	65	HAYWARD CLOSE	TE
12	371	RUSHINGTON AVENUE	TE
7	320	TENNYSON ROAD	TE
2	62	SEDFIELD CLOSE	TE
13	622	HAMMONDS GREEN	TE
2	83	BISHOPS CLOSE (SPINE)	TE
2	70	BISHOPS CLOSE (SPUR)	TE
10	442	HAMMONDS LANE	TE
2	38	BONIFACE CLOSE (SPINE)	TE
6	231	LYDLYNCH ROAD	TE
21	1165	TESTWOOD LANE (SPINE)	TE
2	83	TESTWOOD LANE	TE
2	63	CAUSEWAY CRESCENT (NORTH SPUR)	TE
4	184	CAUSEWAY CRESCENT (SOUTH SPUR)	TE
10	308	BROKENFORD LANE (SOUTH)	TE
5	178	BROKENFORD AVENUE	TE
5	165	OSBORNE ROAD	TE
4	152	POWELL CRESCENT (SPINE)	TE
2	153	MEADOW CLOSE	TE
5	205	BARTRAM ROAD	TE
2	133	LEXY ROAD (NORTH SECTION)	TE
7	328	OLD MAGAZINE CLOSE	MA
6	251	THE CRESCENT	MA
4	105	JESSOP CLOSE	HY
7	232	ALEXANDRA ROAD	HY
4	166	MOUSEHOLE LANE	HY
2	93	TATES ROAD	HY
9	324	LADYCROSS ROAD	HY
13	329	FULMAR DRIVE	HY
9	296	CURLEW DRIVE	HY
1	45	TERN CLOSE (HEAD)	HY
9	312	CRETE ROAD	HY
20	920	BUTTS ASH LANE	HY
5	222	YELVERTON AVENUE	HY
7	247	ASHLEIGH CLOSE	HY
8	389	THE DROVE	FA
2	90	HAMPTON GARDENS	FA
4	146	NORTHHAMPTON LANE	FA
9	420	WALKERS LANE NORTH	FA
12	479	MOPLEY	FA
9	394	OAK ROAD	HY
2	182	OAK CLOSE	HY
5	195	SUNNINGDALE	HY
2	62	GLENSIDE	HY
3	51	LANGDOWN LAWN CLOSE (SPINE)	HY

18	681	FAIRVIEW DRIVE	HY
5	173	FERN ROAD	HY
5	220	SYCAMORE ROAD	HY
6	512	HOLLYBANK ROAD	HY
7	300	FAIRWAY ROAD	HY
6	257	SOLENT DRIVE	HY
2	45	ASHLEY CROSS CLOSE	FA
4	185	WESTBOURNE AVENUE	FA
8	341	RENDA ROAD	FA
5	211	WATTON ROAD	FA
9	343	WALTONS AVENUE	FA
2	95	SLOANE AVENUE	FA
12	545	SPRINGFIELD AVENUE	FA
3	113	LONG LANE CLOSE (HEAD)	FA
8	397	SCHOOL ROAD	FA
4	29	THE PENTAGON	FA
1	49	WOODGLADE CLOSE FOOTPATH	MA
4	161	HURST ROAD FOOTPATH	RI
16	436	RUSHINGTON CYCLE PATH	TE
2	319	HOBART ROAD	NM
1	255	SPENCER ROAD (n)	NM
1	312	BAYS ROAD	LP
1	316	NORTHFIELD ROAD	MF
1	428	RUMBRIDGE STREET- TOTTON	TE
1	1177	HIGHTOWN ROAD	RI
2	619	CHURCH LANE (PART)	FA
1	1262	NORTHFIELD ROAD	RI
1	232	BUTLERS LANE	RI
1	627	BICKERLEY ROAD	RI
1	66	NUTSEY LANE (PART)	TE
1	355	NUTSEY LANE (PART) (S HAMPSHIRE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE)	TE
2	270	PARKSIDE	TE
1	925	TAVELLS LANE	MA
1	559	NOADS WAY	HY
1	322	GOLDEN HIND PARK	HY
1	55	ARMADA DRIVE (S SPUR-LINK)	HY
1	562	WHITEFIELD ROAD	FA
2	1456	LIME KILN LANE	FA
1	959	HOLBURY DROVE	FA
736		<b>NUMBER OF LIGHTS</b>	

**LIGHTS IN SENSITIVE AREAS** (pl. see Appendix 3 for list of areas)

NO OF LIGHTS	LENGTH OF LINK	ROAD NAME	PARISH (pl see Appendix 1 for key)
13	466	ROOKES LANE	LP
11	524	FOXHILLS (PART)	AC
3	85	OAK TREE PARADE	BR
5	201	SHAGGS MEADOW	LY
2	43	OAK CLOSE	LY
6	233	FIR ROAD	AC
7	278	WOOD ROAD	AC
3	116	ASH GROVE	AC
7	314	DENE WAY	AC
57		<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF LIGHTS</b>	

## RESPONSES TO CONSULTATIONS

**List of Parishes that are classed as sensitive areas**  
(as agreed in previous Cabinet report)

ASHURST & COLBURY
BEAULIEU
BROCKENHURST
BREAMORE
BOLDRE
BRANSGORE
BURLEY
BRAMSHAW
COPYTHORNE
DAMERHAM
DENNY LODGE
EAST BOLDRE
ELLINGHAM, HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY
EXBURY & LEPE
GODSHILL
HALE
HYDE
LYNDHURST
MINSTEAD
MARTIN
NETLEY MARSH
ROCKBOURNE
SANDLEHEATH
SOPLEY
SWAY
WHITSBURY
WOODGREEN

**Cllr Pat Wyeth** – In roads where there are pole mounted lights, would not want new lights if existing poles and lights ok and low key. Accepts that if BT and Electricity companies decide to remove the poles then alternatives have to be found. Fully understand the need to save money where possible. Does not object to the transfer, but just hope there may be an opportunity to comment if and when the time comes.

**Cllr Paul Vickers** – No concerns raised.