

Contact Name: *Jan Debnam*

Tel No: *023 8028 5588*

E-mail: *jan.debnam@nfdc.gov.uk*

Date: *30 October 2013*

NOTIFICATION OF PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION

On 28 October 2013, Cllr Vickers, the Planning and Transportation Portfolio Holder, made the following decision. Any member of the Council, who is not a Portfolio Holder, who considers that this decision should be reviewed should give notice to the Monitoring Officer (Grainne O'Rourke) (in writing or by e-mail) to be received **ON OR BY WEDNESDAY 6 NOVEMBER 2013**

Details of the documents the Portfolio Holder considered are attached.

DECISION:

To amend the list of transportation proposals to promote walking and cycling, to assist public transport and to mitigate the adverse impact of traffic in the District outside the National Park area. This list forms the basis for seeking developers' contributions on developments.

REASON(S):

To take account of responses to a recent consultation exercise and consequently to make the best use of the monies received.

ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED:

As set out in the report considered by the Portfolio Holder.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DECLARED:

None

For Further Information Please Contact:

Nick Hunt
Principal Engineer
Tel: 023 8028 5588
E-Mail: nick.hunt@nfdc.gov.uk

AMENDMENTS TO THE NEW FOREST TRANSPORT STATEMENT LIST OF TRANSPORT PROPOSALS TO PROMOTE WALKING, CYCLING, ASSIST PUBLIC TRANSPORT & MITIGATE THE ADVERSE IMPACT OF TRAFFIC IN THE DISTRICT OUTSIDE THE NATIONAL PARK

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Transport Contributions Policy (TCP) list of transport schemes was agreed by both New Forest District Council (NFDC) and Hampshire County Council (HCC) in the summer of 2010 (www.newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=10669). The Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment at Hampshire County Council adopted the [New Forest District Transport Statement](#) on 11th September 2012. The adopted Transport Statement aims to provide a comprehensive level of local transport policy for the District and includes a list of transportation schemes.
- 1.2 The list of schemes included in the New Forest Transport District Statement was largely based on the Transport Contributions Policy (TCP) list of schemes jointly agreed by Hampshire County Council (HCC) and New Forest District Council's (NFDC) Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation. NFDC consulted with District and local County Members, Town and Parish Councils, technical officers and other stakeholder representatives as part of the development of the TCP schemes list.
- 1.3 The list of transport proposals were identified, as a basis for seeking developer contributions, to provide improvements within the District outside the National Park to promote walking and cycling, to assist public transport and mitigate against the adverse impact of traffic.
- 1.4 The schemes list is intended to be reviewed and amended regularly in order to take account of any change in local circumstances and to enable members of the public, councillors and officers to suggest new schemes or changes to existing schemes where appropriate.
- 1.5 The reports and schemes lists approved by the NFDC Portfolio Holder stated that the Head of Planning and the Principal Engineer (Transportation), both in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and appropriate HCC officers, be authorised to make minor changes to the proposals to take account of:
 - the recommendations in safety audit reports
 - the conclusions of feasibility studies
 - new or amended proposals suggested by HCC and NFDC Officers and Local Members.
- 1.6 Location maps have been produced as background documents to assist the identification of proposals for the consultations carried out to date. The maps will be updated to reflect the decisions made as a result of this report (www.newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=10727).

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The transport proposals identified in this report take account of suggestions received from HCC and NFDC officers, Councillors as well as members of the public.
- 2.2 All the proposed amendments to the list were subject to consultations with local NFDC and HCC Councillors and the relevant town or parish councils. A list of those consulted is included in Appendix 2.

#

3. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEMES LIST

- 3.1 The proposed amendments to the existing schemes list are set out in Appendix 1. A summary of the consultation responses received together with an NFDC officer's response is also included in Appendix 1. The proposals have been amended, where applicable, to take account of comments received.
- 3.2 Full details of the process of initially identifying the schemes and the policy background to the formulation of the schemes list was explained in the earlier reports. This was taken into account in the proposed amendments to the transport schemes list.
- 3.3 The implementation of individual proposals depends on a number of factors including:
- Availability of developers' contributions and other funds for detailed design and implementation
 - Other priorities
 - Safety audit approval
 - Land acquisition etc. and special approvals/related measures (e.g. traffic regulation orders).
 - Availability of non-financial resources for design and implementation.

#

The inclusion of a proposal in the schemes list should not be taken as a commitment that the scheme will be progressed in the near future by either HCC or NFDC.

- 3.4 It is suggested that developers' contributions be sought for the transport proposals. In seeking and allocating transport contributions there is a general requirement to comply with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister Circular 05/2005 (communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/147537.pdf). The allocation of developers' transport contributions to individual transport proposals will be the subject of separate Portfolio Holder decisions.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of the recommendations other than the on-going administration linked to the collection and allocation of contributions which can be met from existing resources.

- 4.2 Developers' transport contributions must only be spent on transport proposals. NFDC only allocates contributions that it has received.
- 4.3 When identifying which proposals should be developer funded consideration has been given to the anticipated cost of the scheme and the anticipated value of contributions available for the period up to 2026.
- 4.4 The allocation of developers' transport related contributions, held by NFDC, for individual schemes will be the subject of District Council Portfolio Holder Decisions on a case by case basis in consultation with HCC.
- 4.5 Generally transport schemes funded from developers' contributions will be progressed by HCC or, subject to HCC's agreement, NFDC. Design work can be paid for from contributions but the contributions should not be used to fund feasibility studies, temporary works or trial schemes. The principle being that the developer funded proposal will be of direct long term benefit to the development.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Walking, cycling and the use of public transport offers an alternative to reliance on the private car especially in larger settlements where the local facilities and amenities are within a reasonable distance for walking and cycling and accessible by public transport. The schemes that mitigate against the adverse impact of traffic can also improve the local environment by reducing congestion and ensuring the transport network runs in a more efficient manner.

6. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no crime and disorder implications associated with this report.

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Improvements to walking routes and some public transport infrastructure improvements will assist those with mobility impairments. Otherwise there are no equality and diversity Implications associated with this report.

8. PROPOSED DECISION

- # 8.1 The proposed amendments and additions to the New Forest District Transport Statement list of transport proposals as set out in the schedule, attached as Appendix 1, is agreed as a basis for seeking developer contributions.

9. REASONS

- 9.1 In accordance with the Core Strategy Policy (newforest.gov.uk/media/adobe/o/t/FINAL_DOCUMENT.pdf) and

Proposed Amendments to the Transport Contributions List

Fawley

Amendment to existing scheme on the schemes list

Existing scheme: FA/T/43 – Church Lane/Marsh Lane Junction: Change priorities so Marsh Lane is the give way leg.

Proposed amendment: Retain existing priorities but introduce speed reduction measures to slow traffic at the junction to give “FA/T/43 – Church Lane/Marsh Lane Junction: Speed reduction measures”.

Reason for amendment: The original scheme was suggested by the Parish Council however the police raised concerns about the safety of a changed junction priority scheme. Therefore it is suggested to change the scheme to include speed reduction measures, possibly including build outs together with a raised junction table. The aim being to reduce traffic speeds to the benefit of residents, pedestrians and cyclists in particular those travelling to the nearby Fawley Infant School. This will encourage non car travel in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 12

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Summary of comments received and Officer Response
1	Fawley Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) At a committee meeting of Fawley Parish Council it was resolved to support the proposed amendments to existing NFDC transport schemes. ii) It is hoped that the scheme proceeds as soon as possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Support noted. ii) The scheme can be progressed if the scheme is agreed and funding is identified and allocated to the scheme.
2	Resident on Church Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Dismayed at the proposals. Believed the proposal was for a change in priorities of the Church Lane/Marsh Lane junction which would solve the speed issue, be more cost effective and have less impact on the residents. ii) The raised table would lead to noise from cars bumping over them at 5-6am when the Exxon shift change happens. iii) Objects to build-outs being outside his property making access and egress even more difficult. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Objection noted. The original proposal was a changed junction priority however the police raised safety concerns with this and did not support that proposal. Consequently an alternative traffic calming solution was sought and a raised junction table has been suggested. ii) Noise can be an adverse effect of speed humps however a longer speed table such as that proposed promotes a more smooth drive and so noise is considered to not be such a significant issue to prevent the scheme being implemented. iii) The proposal is at an early feasibility stage and so further detailed work will be required if it is to go ahead. Therefore exact locations of build-outs etc. in a final design may differ and access and egress of driveways should not be made

			more difficult.
3	Resident on Church Lane	<p>i) Objects to the proposed scheme. Many vehicles travel too fast and currently try to avoid using the main part of Church Lane and divert off Marsh Lane towards the village centre. It is feared the proposed scheme will encourage more vehicles to use this part of the village to avoid the expected 'bottle neck' that is bound to occur.</p> <p>ii) It is suggested that parking should not be allowed in Church Lane / Marsh Lane to avoid any traffic build up.</p> <p>iii) Speed humps of some form would be useful although the resulting noise from the decelerating and accelerating vehicles would be an issue for residents.</p> <p>iv) An alternative suggestion is a one way scheme at the end of Church Lane (from the village).</p>	<p>i) It is not envisaged that the vehicles leaving or entering the refinery site will reroute to avoid a build-out on Church Lane. The vehicle flows are not considered to be sufficiently high along this stretch for a significant 'bottleneck' to occur. Approximately 3 times as many vehicles travel south along Church Lane compared to the south east section of Church Lane towards the village centre.</p> <p>ii) Traffic Management issues such as parking issues are monitored following implementation of such schemes to assess if any related adverse impacts occur. It is not envisaged parking will be a problem but this would be considered at the detailed design stage and assessed post implementation.</p> <p>iii) Noise can be an adverse effect of speed humps however a longer speed table such as that proposed promotes a more smooth drive and so noise is considered to not be a significant issue.</p> <p>iv) The traffic flows within the village are not considered to be a significant issue and the benefits of implementing a one way are not obvious. The purpose of this scheme is to reduce vehicle speeds entering leaving the refinery site and enhancing safety at the Church Lane / Marsh Lane junction. A one way scheme may increase speeds on Church Lane and make the junction less safe than present.</p>
DECISION: Amend scheme taking account of comments relating to build-outs.			

Fordingbridge

Amendment to existing scheme on the schemes list

Existing scheme: FO/T/02 - Penny's Lane to Marl Lane cycle route (crossing Whitsbury Road) via Charnwood Drive and Avon Meade and along former railway line. Link through residential area with link to school off Burnham Road.

Amend scheme to divert the route along Allen Water Drive and Parsonage Park Drive to read as follows: "FO/T/02 - Penny's Lane to Marl Lane cycle route (crossing Whitsbury Road) via Avon Meade, Parsonage Park Drive and along the former railway line. Link through residential area with link to school off Burnham Road."

The original scheme connected through narrow footway links, however these have been reconsidered and deemed to be unsuitable for cycling and it is suggested to amend the cycle route to reduce the amount of off road sections and divert the route along the existing road network via Allen Water Drive and Parsonage Park Drive. The proposed link from the Whitsbury Road area to the open space off Allen Water Drive via Parsonage Park Drive is a more direct route and is a more viable proposal.

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Officer's Comments
1	Resident on Allen Water Drive	<p>i) It is a crazy scheme developed by looking at a map without any local knowledge of this proposed route. Urges the route is reconsidered. Charnwood Drive & Avon Meade are quiet, flat 'backwater' residential roads; Parsonage Park Drive is a long mostly straight route used as a cut through to connect to Station Road (on route to Old Brickyard Road Industrial Estate, Sandleheath) via Normandy Way, to avoid using the route through the centre of the town. Commercial vehicles constantly use this route, making it hazardous to cyclists.</p> <p>ii) The road is relatively free of parked vehicles and vehicles drive too fast impacting on the safety of cyclists. Allen Water Drive is no better, as it is narrow, with steep inclines, incorporating several zig-zag bends & sadly few drivers use the road with consideration for other users of the road. There are also several closes off this road & drivers take no notice of white lines at these junctions, driving straight out onto Allen Water Drive.</p>	<p>i) Prior to consultation NFDC officers walked the route and considered the route to be satisfactory. The original route passed through many narrow pedestrian access points with limited or no scope for widening as such would likely lead to conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>ii) Lack of parked vehicles supports a cycle route as there would be a lack of obstructions forcing cyclists towards the centre of the carriageway. Vehicle speed and flow data was recorded for Parsonage Park Drive, this showed 85%ile and mean speeds for a typical day of 31mph and 26.3mph respectively and an average daily flow of 1963 vehicles. This scenario is on the edge of the parameters for cycle lanes; as such it is considered an on road route together with signage and road markings such as cycle pads to increase drivers' awareness would be acceptable as it should reduce vehicle speeds. At detailed design stage a safety audit will be carried out to assess if further traffic calming features are required.</p>
DECISION: Amend scheme route and scheme to include signage and markings as per 1 (ii) above.			

Milford on Sea

Addition to Schemes List - New Scheme Proposal

Scheme Proposal: MF/T/16 - **High Street:** existing zebra crossing to be converted to a humped crossing, also to include speed reducing features in advance of the suggested raised zebra crossing.

The scheme was suggested by the Parish Council with the aim of improving safety for pedestrians in the village centre. This will encourage non car travel in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 12.

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Officer's Comments
1	Resident on High Street, Milford-on-Sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Are in favour of the general plan ii) Concerns about the position of the pinch point opposite their property. The pinch points should not impede the entrance and exit from their driveway particularly for longer vehicles such as car and trailer requiring a wider swing to enter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Support noted ii) Concern regarding the build out is noted. In accordance with Government guidance single road humps are generally not recommended unless they can be used in conjunction with other speed reducing features. This is in order to slow vehicles and give adequate warning before a single raised feature. If build outs are included as part of this scheme access and egress of driveways should not be impeded. The suitability of including build-outs will be considered further as part of the detailed design process.
2	No address supplied by responder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No real objection to the proposal but requests no pinch points in view of the problems experienced in Brockenhurst. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Concern regarding the build out is noted. See 1 (ii) above.
3	Resident in Barnes Lane, Milford-on-Sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Suggest the raised table is put in place at the earliest possibility as the pedestrian crossing is becoming exceedingly dangerous. Drivers either do not see the crossing or do not care. There have been many near misses and incidences on the crossing. Vehicles coming from the north east direction are frequently travelling too fast round the bend and do not have time to stop. Blind and elderly people in the village cross the road at a slow pace and are often in need of assistance. Traffic lights have been requested previously but Councillor Kendal did not think that was a good idea. The sooner the traffic calming measures are in place the better before there is a fatal accident on that road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Support noted. The scheme is designed to slow traffic to reduce issues raised. Installation of traffic signals is very expensive and is more appropriate on roads with particularly high traffic flows.

4	No address supplied by responder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Supports the scheme. Many people have spotted motor vehicles speeding through that area and not stopping. ii) Also suggested that more speed tables in the village centre are required near The Green and near The Smugglers Inn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Support noted. The scheme is designed to slow traffic to reduce the vehicle speeds at this location. ii) There is a proposal for an improved crossing point and traffic calming in the vicinity of The Smugglers Inn (MF/T/13). However at present there is no funding for its implementation.
5	Resident in Grebe Close, Milford-on-Sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Supports the scheme and comments that crossing the road at that location is dangerous due to high traffic speeds. ii) Traffic may divert from this route increasing rat running on New Valley Road, which can increase the safety risk for school children drop-offs/pick-ups in the Manor Road/B3058 junction area – monitoring is suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Support noted and the purpose of the scheme is to reduce speeds to ensure safe pedestrian crossing in the village centre. ii) Following implementation of schemes such as this, monitoring is undertaken to assess the efficacy of the scheme and to review if any adverse impacts arise. It is not envisaged traffic will divert to avoid a single or small number of traffic calming features.
6	Resident in Milford-on-Sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) It is an excellent idea and deserves everybody's support. Most vehicles are travelling well above the speed limit, especially coming 'down the hill' from Lymington. Sometimes the most dangerous places have the least recorded incidents because pedestrians and cyclists are taking extreme personal safety measures to avoid them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Support noted.
7	Resident in Kivernell Road, Milford-on-Sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Objects to the scheme. The scheme is a waste of money; if it was required it should have been implemented at the same time as the road resurfacing. Funding should be spent on filling pot holes. ii) It is not needed as the speeds are not excessive. iii) The pinch points will force people into head on confrontations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The road maintenance works under Operation resilience is organised by HCC. This scheme is a new proposal and is subject to consultation prior to being agreed for inclusion on the schemes list. Additionally it has not been identified for development in any works programme and at the time of consultation there was no identified funding for its implementation. Therefore there are no timescales for delivery and it could not have been coordinated with the recent resurfacing works. ii) It is noted that the speeds are not excessively high however the perception is that many vehicles do not respect pedestrians' right of way over the crossing so a traffic calming feature will assist safe pedestrian crossing. iii) The need for provision of build-outs will be considered at detailed design stage. See 1(ii) above.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) The hump will cause discomfort to bus passengers, any back injuries will result in action taken against the council. v) Noise will be an issue for residents vi) Vibration caused by vehicles traversing the hump can cause potential damage to buildings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) Hump gradients are a compromise between the degree of speed reduction and environmental impact (passenger discomfort/vehicle noise/vibration). The elongated speed tables allow buses and larger vehicles to have front and rear vehicles on the table at the same time, ensuring a smoother passing over the feature. It is considered that if speed tables are traversed at appropriate speeds the level of discomfort will be acceptable. v) Noise can be an adverse effect of speed humps however a longer speed table such as that proposed promotes a more smooth drive and so noise is considered to not be a significant issue. vi) Regarding increased vibration affecting nearby properties, the magnitude of vibrations is affected by a number of factors including vehicle speeds/loading/suspension, distance from source and soil type. There is no conclusive evidence that traffic induced vibration can cause significant risk of even minor damage to property.
8	Resident on High Street, Milford-on-Sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Objects to the scheme. There will be increased noise resulting from vehicles braking and accelerating over the hump. ii) Pinch points are a cause of accidents and will cause inconvenience to emergency services and public transport. iii) Lack of planning as the road has been resurfaced. iv) Speed camera should be installed as this would alleviate the problem and generate useful income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Objection noted. See 7 (v) above. ii) See 1 (ii) above. iii) See 7(i) above. iv) Speed cameras and enforcement is provided by the police. The installation of a speed camera is very costly and would not meet the road safety based criteria for installation here. Income is no longer retained by the enforcing authority.
9	No address supplied by responder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Objects to the proposal. It is unfortunate that people drive too fast through the village, particularly traffic approaching on Park Road, however the pinch points proposed will not have much effect at reducing speeds. Speed bumps before the bridge to the west and by the common to the east would be better. ii) Humps would be a problem to buses and commercial vehicles. iii) More consideration should be given to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Objects to the scheme. A speed table is considered to be an effective way of reducing speeds and enhancing safety at the crossing location. See 1(ii) above regarding build-outs/pinch-points. ii) See 7 (iv) above iii) See 8 (iv) above.

		two speed cameras, which would slow down the traffic, be easier to install and identify and punish the offenders.	
10	Resident in Carrington Close, Milford-on-Sea	<p>i) Objects to the scheme. If traffic speed is thought to be a problem a 20mph limit should be considered.</p> <p>ii) Pinch-points are considered to be dangerous and could be a cause of accidents.</p> <p>iii) Rather than spending money on this proposal funds should be put towards the B3058 and A337 junction at Everton.</p>	<p>i) Objection noted. HCC is currently piloting 20mph zones across the county in order to assess their efficacy. The outcomes of this monitoring will be taken into account in considering whether further programmes of 20mph speed limits will be developed in the future. However the appropriateness of this on a B class road would need to be considered also.</p> <p>ii) See 1 (ii) above.</p> <p>iii) Traditionally the junction improvement referred to has been the priority transport scheme for the Milford on Sea area, however given the level of contributions received in the Parish and the high cost of the scheme it has been considered inappropriate to continue to 'pot build' for that scheme as sufficient funding is unlikely to be achieved to enable the scheme to be implemented. Therefore it has been decided to divert funding to schemes that have a real prospect of delivery.</p>
11	Resident in Park Lane, Milford-on-Sea	<p>i) Objects to the scheme highlighting concern regarding the height of the speed table as they can catch mud flaps even at minimal speed and can impact on the journeys of emergency services.</p> <p>ii) Does not support the use of pinch points, stating that they often cause confusion as to who has right of way, leading to one vehicle needing to retreat to avoid collision or sudden braking when one is approached - potential for an accident. They also can cause traffic to back up and therefore impede free flow.</p> <p>iii) It is suggested that coloured road markings with text warnings on both approaches together with a 20mph speed limit should be provided. This could</p>	<p>i) The height and dimensions of the table will take account of government guidance. The impact of traffic calming schemes on emergency service vehicles is an important consideration however given the calming is likely to be a single or small number of features any delay is not expected to be significant.</p> <p>ii) See 1 (ii) above</p> <p>iii) Coloured road markings could be added to the scheme in order to raise awareness of the need to reduce speeds however it is not considered this would be solely sufficient to reduce vehicle speeds at this location. See 10 (i) above</p>

		extend into the shopping centre of the village.	regarding 20mph limits.
12	Resident in Milford-on-Sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Does not support the scheme. Appears no accidents have actually occurred at the crossing and the 85th percentile speeds are not in excess of the legal limit. However there are often near misses in the area close to the crossing involving abrupt braking albeit from relatively low speeds. ii) The crossing is not in an ideal position – there is barely 60m vision for drivers east of the crossing so people crossing are seen at the last moment. Ideally the crossing should be moved approximately 60 metres east giving 100's of metres of clear sight lines in each direction but it would probably then not be where pedestrians would "desire" to walk. iii) Many drivers pass through this section of road at low speeds and are often looking around presumably at shops and not concentrating on the road ahead – (i.e. inattention - the cause of almost 60% of accidents nationally.) It is obvious that other drivers who may well be at the legal limit or over are concentrating on their driving and are far more alert to hazards. iv) The downhill approach around a bend from the east is a significant problem. Raising the crossing requires the slowing of traffic but your suggested sites of build outs/pinch points are far enough away from the crossing for speeding drivers to regain any speed they had lost. Also the engineering features are often counterproductive as they become accident sites in their own right. v) Discussions with a Police accident investigating officer indicated he did not necessarily support deliberate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) It is noted that the speeds are not excessively high however the perception is that many vehicles do not respect pedestrians' right of way over the zebra crossing so a traffic calming feature will assist. ii) When the crossing was implemented it was considered to meet visibility requirements and in addition warning signage has been installed to enhance drivers' awareness when approaching the crossing. The location is also designed to take account of pedestrian desire lines as well as driver visibility issues. iii) The purpose of the speed table is to reduce vehicle speeds, the provision of this and appropriate signage should affect driver behaviour. Drivers are expected to drive with due care and attention. iv) The plan showing the build-outs is indicative only and the provision or exact location of build-outs will be subject to change in the detailed design. The issue of "speeding up" between features will be taken into consideration in any final design. See 1(ii) above. v) Amendments to the scheme incorporating aspects such as road surfacing could be added to the scheme at detailed design stage.

		<p>obstructions and agreed that high grip anti-skid surface on the approaches to the crossing and possible flashing amber lights (speed/vehicle activated) to the existing pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>vi) If this raised crossing plan goes ahead presumably NFDC have established that although the “incline/decline” of these raised platforms is not that significant, no vibration and/or structural damage will occur to adjacent properties.</p>	<p>vi) See 7 (vi) above</p>
13	Resident in Milford-on-Sea	<p>i) Agrees the crossing needs to be enhanced to make it safer for all. Vehicles appear to be travelling above 30mph when approaching the crossing but the raised section should be gently ramped and be a minimum of 30m in length so large vehicles are completely mounted on the raised surface. This is to minimise noise and reduce neck injuries of passengers.</p> <p>ii) Disagrees with pinch-points as the narrow roads will not accommodate them sufficiently well and will result in large vehicles stopping and starting; increasing noise, pollution, fray tempers and make the area far more dangerous, particularly for westbound traffic. If an eastern pinch-point is required it should be 20m further east and road colouring should be used to advise drivers extra care is needed. The eastbound pinch-point is in an already complicated place so may cause more chaos.</p> <p>iii) Vehicles from the west travel fast as they have descended from the cliff top and vehicles from the east have driven around a right hand bend before they see the crossing. A well-designed modestly ramped speed hump should be</p>	<p>i) Support noted. The speed table will be designed to government specifications and will aim to have minimal disruption to drivers’ and passengers’ comfort whilst being sufficient to reduce vehicle speeds.</p> <p>ii) See 1 (ii) above.</p> <p>iii) The raised zebra crossing is designed to slow traffic as well as increase safety at the crossing point as it is perceived that vehicles are not respecting pedestrians’ right of way on the zebra crossing. The speed table is suggested to be long enough for large vehicles e.g. buses to have both front and rear wheels on the raised section at the same time to</p>

		positioned on the westbound lane of the B3058 20m prior to the one-way exit from the village High Street. A second Hump should be placed on the eastbound lane just prior to the eastbound bus stop. The humps should be wide enough to slow down cars and vans but be narrow enough to allow very large heavy vehicles i.e. Buses to pass over smoothly.	encourage a smooth drive over the feature.
DECISION: Add scheme to the list.			

New Milton

Addition to Schemes List - New Scheme Proposal

Scheme Proposal: NM/T/47 - **Green Lane**: section of footway from Greenfield Garden to Becton Lane on the southern side.

Reason for inclusion: Concern regarding pedestrian safety at this location (particularly school children) has been raised by a resident. The scheme aims to provide a safer link to Becton Lane and improve pedestrian accessibility along Green Lane, particularly for children walking to school. This will encourage non car travel in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 7 and 12.

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Officers' Response
1	Resident on Green Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Does not want the ditch to be removed but believes it may become too steep to maintain depending on how the pathway is situated. ii) Concern that people would pull into their drive to pass oncoming vehicles. iii) Road calming was suggested in the form of a raised bricked surface (the same as is in Penny Hedge) and a narrower entrance from Becton Lane into Green Lane to reduce the speed of the cars. iv) Alternatively a one way from Greenfield Lane to Becton Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The scheme is at concept stage and further details will be made available if/when the scheme is progressed. ii) The road is not being narrowed so there should not be a need for vehicles to use the driveway as a passing place. iii) Traffic speeds are not considered to be an issue. 85%ile speeds are around 30mph and so is not deemed to be a speed enforcement issue. iv) One way systems can encourage higher speeds as drivers do not expect to encounter traffic travelling the opposite way so may make the area less safe for pedestrians where there is no footway.

2	Resident on Green Lane	i) Supports the scheme as Green Lane can be dangerous for pedestrians as cars use it as a cut through and there is insufficient room for both pedestrians and vehicles on the carriageway.	i) Support noted. The scheme aims to address this safety concern.
3	Resident on Green Lane	i) Supports the scheme and asked for clarification on detailed design of scheme, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of works • Proposed width of footway • Retention of ditches / additional drainage • Construction timings 	i) Support noted. The scheme is at concept stage and further details will be made available if/when the scheme is progressed.
DECISION: Add scheme to the list.			

Addition to Schemes List - New Scheme Proposal

Scheme Proposal: NM/T/48 - **Sea Road/Byron Road:** improvement and widening of footways adjacent to garage (improve pedestrian facilities, particularly for those with impaired mobility, as well as preventing parking of vehicles on highways land)

Reason for scheme: The improvements have been suggested in order to improve pedestrian movements around the corner of this junction. This will encourage non car travel in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 12.

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Officers' Response
1	Cllr Beck	Any move to sort out the problem, in particular for pedestrians and the disabled, is a move in the right direction.	i) <i>Support noted</i>
DECISION: Add scheme to the list.			

Ringwood

Amendment to existing scheme on the schemes list

Existing scheme: PC13 RI - Town centre to A338 Salisbury Road.

Proposed amendment: Amend proposal to extend the shared pedestrian/cycle route adjacent to Salisbury Road to a path north of Ivy Lane, to change description to: **Town centre to A338 Salisbury Road**: extension to shared pedestrian/cycle route adjacent to Salisbury Road to path north of Ivy Lane.

Reason for amendment: The original scheme stops short of Blashford Lakes. By providing this additional link it better connects north to Blashford Lakes from the existing cycle route and connects to Ivy Lane for route through lakes area. This will encourage cycling in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 12.

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Officers' Response
1	Resident in Ibsley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Supports the amendment and highlights the project is in agreement with paragraph 3.44 of the Blashford Lakes Strategic Management Plan. The scheme will provide a safer link into the lakes area as currently it stops short. ii) Suggests that if the bridge creates an issue a dismount section should be considered. iii) Other queries included the path being adopted by the County as a bridleway, the cycle route being an alternative strategic cycle route from Ringwood to the New Forest via Moyles Court and for the Blashford Lakes to be shown on the map and Information Board in Ringwood Car Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Support noted. ii) As part of any detailed design issues such as the extent of space available on the bridge to make a path viable will be considered. iii) As in (ii), above, during detailed design further consideration will be made to these issues. However the comments raised have been forwarded to relevant organisations where relevant.
2	Cllr Emma Lane, Ellingham Harbridge & Ibsley Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) EHIPC wholeheartedly support the inclusion of PC13RI extension to cycle path along A338. It is something that has been considered for a long time and would benefit not just the parish but also the wider community. It would make it safer to both pedestrians and cyclists and give better access to both the lakes and the Forest. ii) Request that the path is considered to be a bridleway to accommodate horse riders in the vicinity. iii) Parish Council may have some s106 monies available to allocate to the project should it be successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Support noted ii) See 1 (iii) above. Comments have been forwarded to colleagues at HCC with regard to the path being an adopted bridleway. iii) Financial contributions towards the implementation of the scheme will be beneficial and greatly assist in its implementation.

DECISION: Amend scheme on the list.

Totton

Amendment to existing scheme on the schemes list

Existing scheme: TE/T/01 - Coblands Avenue / Ringwood Rd to Water Lane (via Bagber Rd) on and adjacent to road route

Proposed amendment: Amend proposal to the on road section along Coblands Avenue and replace with an adjacent to road section continuing along Ringwood Road west from the traffic light junction. Also to include widening of the footway to the eastern edge of the school to link Ringwood Road to Lydlynch Road. Scheme description would be - **Ringwood Rd to Water Lane (via Lydlynch Road and Bagber Rd)** on and adjacent to road route.

Proposed change is to remove the on road section along Coblands Avenue and replace with an adjacent to road section continuing along Ringwood Road west from the traffic light junction. This will be a more direct route providing better connection between the town centre and west Totton. The widened footway link adjacent to Forest Park School will also better cater for cyclists and pedestrians in the area.

This route will provide a connection to the town centre and the schools on Ringwood Road. The route connects to the existing off road routes to the west, providing greater connectivity to western Totton and the schools and facilities there. This will encourage cycling in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 12.

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Officers' Response
	N/A	No comments received.	i) <i>Noted that there were no objections:</i> Scheme to be amended as described.

Amendment to existing scheme on the schemes list

Existing scheme TE/T/06 - **Calmore to Water Lane via Hammonds Green**: Cycle route.

Proposed amendment: Amend scheme to reinstate priorities at the junction of Goodwood Gardens and Calmore Drive and add a raised junction table. The scheme is mostly implemented however the change of priority for the junction of Calmore Drive and Goodwood Gardens has been the subject of an independent review and it is suggested to reinstate the original priority, with Goodwood Gardens being the give way leg and add a raised junction table at the junction to encourage slower vehicle speeds at the junction. This can improve safety and encourage cycling in this area.

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Officers' Response
1	No address supplied by responder	i) Concurs that this may be a better feature than the present layout.	i) <i>Support noted.</i>
DECISION: Scheme to be amended as described.			

Addition to Schemes List - New Scheme Proposal

Proposed scheme: TE/T/78 - **Salisbury Road (nr Cooks Lane)**: Provision of centre island together with speed reduction measures to assist crossing near to the football ground.

Reason for scheme: The scheme was suggested by a local Councillor and is proposed to improve safety for pedestrian movements across Salisbury Road. This will encourage non car travel in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 12.

The suggested location is near the northbound bus lay-by to align with the existing footway. Carriageway at this location is approximately 8m wide. Some carriageway widening may be necessary to allow the movement of HGVs, which serve the adjacent industrial estates, Alternatively the bus lay-by could be converted into running carriageway and the bus stop relocated further to the north.

	OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER	COMMENTS	Officers' Response
1	Cllr Alan Weeks	i) Concerned that such a crossing will encourage more football supporters parking in Calmore compounding the problem already experienced by the residents of Cooks Lane.	i) <i>Comments noted. The scheme is to ensure a safe pedestrian crossing at this location. Any impacts on parking will have to be assessed if they arise.</i>
DECISION: Add scheme to the list.			

Consultees:

Town/Parish Councils and NFDC/HCC Councillors for the main towns and villages covered by the proposed amendments:

Ringwood Town Council; Fawley Parish Council; Fordingbridge Town Council; Totton & Eling Town Council; New Milton Town Council; Milford Parish Council; Cllr Christine Ford; Cllr Michael Thierry; Cllr Jeremy Heron; Cllr Barbara Woodfield; Cllr Steve Rippon-Swaine; Cllr George Dart; Cllr Neville Penman; Cllr Di Brooks; Cllr David Russell; Cllr Dean Britton; Cllr Chris Lagdon; Cllr Brian Lucas; Cllr Ron Scrivens; Cllr David Harrison; Cllr Michael Southgate; Cllr Alexis McEvoy; Cllr Bob Wappet; Cllr Philip Fawkes; Cllr Roxanne Bellows; Cllr Ann Sevier; Cllr Edward Heron; Cllr Goff Beck; Cllr Alan OSullivan; Cllr Melville Kendal; Cllr Steve P Davies; Cllr Steve Clarke; Cllr Sophie Beeton; Cllr Alan Rice.

Transport CAN Group, New Forest Access Forum and relevant technical officers from HCC and NFDC.

Notices were also displayed at the site of the proposed schemes detailing the consultation and locations where plans could be reviewed (at Local Information Offices and on NFDC webpages).