

**Contact Name:** *Andy Rogers*

**Tel No:** *023 8028 5588*

**E-mail:** *andy.rogers@nfdc.gov.uk*

**Date:** *19 September 2014*

## **NOTIFICATION OF PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION**

On 17 September 2014, 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 4.45 P.M. ON FRIDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2014.**

Details of the documents the Portfolio Holder considered are attached.

### **DECISION:**

To authorise amendments to the New Forest District Transport Statement proposals as a basis for seeking developer contributions

### **REASON(S):**

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

### **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](mailto:nick.hunt@nfdc.gov.uk)

David Stannard  
Planning Policy Officer (Transportation)  
Tel: 023 8028 5588  
E-mail: [david.stannard@nfdc.gov.uk](mailto:david.stannard@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 (<http://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 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 Transportation 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 (<http://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 and 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, where appropriate, 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. Appendix 2 outlines the consultation process and who was contacted directly as part of the consultation.
- 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. 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 ([http://www.newforest.gov.uk/media/adobe/o/t/FINAL\\_DOCUMENT.pdf](http://www.newforest.gov.uk/media/adobe/o/t/FINAL_DOCUMENT.pdf)) to promote improvements in the quality and sustainability of transport that improve accessibility whilst reducing reliance on the private car.

9.2 To facilitate the securing of developers' contributions towards walking and public transport improvements that will mitigate the impact of new development in accordance with the requirements of ODPM Circular 05/2005.

**10. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED.**

10.1 Not to amend the transport proposals schemes list. The new additions will provide added benefits to their respective locations. Rejecting the proposed additions will not allow for best value of transport schemes in the district. This would prejudice the Core Strategy Policy/Sustainable Community Strategy aspirations and this option is therefore not suggested.

**11. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DECLARED**

11.1 No Councillors declared an interest.

**12. PORTFOLIO HOLDER ENDORSEMENT**

12.1 I have agreed to the recommendations of this report.

Signed: ..CLLR F P VICKERS.....

Date: ..17.09.14.....

Cllr Paul Vickers  
Portfolio Holder Planning & Transportation

<b>FURTHER INFORMATION: Please contact</b>	<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>
Nick Hunt Principal Engineer (Transportation) Tel: 023 8028 5588 E-mail: <a href="mailto:nick.hunt@nfdc.gov.uk">nick.hunt@nfdc.gov.uk</a>	Published papers E-mails in N Hunt's IT Microsoft Office System Files on Transportation Section shared IT Drive
David Stannard Planning Policy Officer (Transportation) Tel: 023 8028 5588 E-mail: <a href="mailto:david.stannard@nfdc.gov.uk">david.stannard@nfdc.gov.uk</a>	

Date on which notice given of this Decision - 19 September 2014

Last date for call-in - 26 September 2014

**Proposed Amendments to the Transport Contributions List**

**Hythe and Dibden**

*Addition to Schemes List - New Scheme Proposal*

Scheme Proposal: HY/T/84 - **Roman Road North**: Provision of footway, where missing along Roman Road North.

Reason for scheme: The aim of the proposal is to enhance pedestrian safety and encourage walking, particularly for those traveling to/from the schools and leisure centre in this area. This will encourage non car travel in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objectives 7 and 12.

	<b>OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER (Names redacted)</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>TRANSPORT ENGINEER'S COMMENTS</b>
1.	Resident, Roman Road, Hythe	<p>My comments will have to be qualified as there is, most unfortunately, no information published other than the layout plan.</p> <p>In principle the footpath would be best sited where you have it on the housing side of the road. People visiting in Roman Road frequently use the south-west grass verge to park but if the footpath were put on that side they would have to park in the road causing at least inconvenience if not hazard.</p> <p>However my main concern is that you do not mention what your intentions are concerning the soakaway ditch which currently collects run-off from the road on the housing side. There is little space between the road edge and the ditch; certainly not sufficient for the ditch to be retained if the footpath is added without reduction in the road width which is presumably not intended. What is intended? Will you simply fill in the ditch to facilitate the footpath or do you have other plans in which case why have you not stated them?</p> <p>In my zone at least the road is higher than the adjacent properties and loss of the ditch would concentrate all run-off in to access gateways. In my case the drain gully in my access apron discharges in to the ditch without which I would suffer flooding during heavy weather periods at least across my gateway.</p> <p>I am in support of the proposal PROVIDED that suitable and adequate alternative provision is made for drainage but not otherwise.</p>	<p>Support of the principle is noted.</p> <p>This consultation is primarily on the principle of a footway along this section of Roman Road in order to assess if a scheme at this location is to be added to a list of transport schemes for the New Forest District for possible future implementation.</p> <p>The comments related to drainage will be taken into consideration if the proposal is progressed to a detailed design stage. At that time further consultation will be undertaken.</p>

2.	Resident at Downwood Close	<p>With reference to the proposed footway along Roman Road from Dibden Purlieu roundabout to Nash Road (<a href="http://www.newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=14523">http://www.newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=14523</a>), is the footway going to be along the bypass side of the roman road as is the case with the already in place footway on Roman Road from Dibden Purlieu roundabout to the bend before Butts Ash Lane ? As this would be logical and very welcome. The map put up along the route isn't very clear on this point. Thanks for any information you can give me on this proposal.</p> <p>I and my wife are in favour of a much needed footway along this stretch of Roman Road. We believe the best side for the footway would be on the bypass side as is the case with the existing path from Dibden Purlieu roundabout to Butts Ash Lane. This would eliminate the need to constantly cross junctions on foot. It would safer at the bend near Oak Road for sighting purposes. It would also tie in with the existing gravel path that leads to the traffic light crossing to the forest and round alongside the roundabout. Also on the houses side there are hedges, drainage ditches and the house owners driveways that will be affected and encroached on. The hedges will need to be cut back regularly as well to avoid encroaching on the path, forcing pedestrians into the road</p>	<p>The current consultation is primarily on the principle of a footway along this section of Roman Road in order to assess if a scheme at this location is to be added to a list of transport schemes for the New Forest District for possible future implementation.</p> <p>The consultation plan shows the footway on the north eastern side of the road (i.e. the side with the houses) as this connects directly to existing footways on the corner of Roman Road and Beaulieu Road, West Road, Roman Way and Nash Road as well as the properties along the road.</p> <p>At this stage we are consulting to see if there is support or objection to a footway at this location and any other comments people may wish to make, such as a preference as to which side of the road the footway should be. If the proposal is progressed to a detailed design stage further consideration will be given to the appropriate side of the road for the footway and at that time further consultation will be undertaken.</p>
3.	Resident at Roman Road	<p>Provision of a footway for Roman Road North is welcome. We think it would be better placed on the side away from the housing for following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Most pedestrians using this route are walking the full route</li> <li>2)This would avoid them crossing the three side roads and each individual entrance</li> <li>3)Vehicles accessing the houses would not cross the footway</li> <li>4)Existing driveways would remain undisturbed</li> <li>5)The work could be carried out with less disturbance to normal use.</li> </ol>	<p>Support noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road. See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>
4.	Resident at Roman Road	<p>Your drawing No R1106 shows the path is planned to run in front of all properties, but I think it makes sense to copy the south east path and have it on the opposite side to improve safety and reduce the risk to pedestrians/cyclists from cars moving in and out of driveways.</p> <p>I think, but am not certain, that some properties have less clear boundaries where the drainage ditch along the proposed route has either been filled in, used for parking or has been fenced or blocked off. This will mean having to either</p>	<p>Support noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road. See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>

		<p>reduce roads width, fill in the ditch or reduce hedges and boundaries. And this seems more expensive and complicated, than swapping sides.</p> <p>Water supply meters are along this route and their access will need to be maintained. A new path will need to consider this, and may make installation more expensive and complicated.</p> <p>In general I support the idea of the path and am glad to see this safety improvement.</p>	
5.	Resident at Roman Road	<p>My property has a narrow grass verge, ditch and hedge adjacent to the road which would need to be constructed on and/or cutback to implement a footway. This would render the hedge useless as a pleasant green boundary and a fence would have to be erected instead. There must be a dozen or more properties in the same situation. A footway on the "forest" side would be preferable, between the gravel areas opposite Nash Road and near the roundabout. An appropriate section of footway on the housing side between Oak Road and the roundabout would be acceptable.</p> <p>The footway would be beneficial for buggy riders, dog walkers, prams etc and preserve the longstanding character of the property frontage.</p>	<p>Support noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road.</p> <p>See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>
6.	Resident at Roman Road	<p>I am a resident of Roman Road living there for 32 years, while I do support a footpath for added safety of both pedestrians and drivers I believe the footpath should be on the other side of the road as there is sufficient space and residents can keep their existing boundaries and hedges which have been growing for many years and many residents take pride in. The proposed footpath would appear to require most of the hedges and ditches be removed.</p> <p>Installing the footway on the opposite side of the road would minimise disruption to residents during construction.</p> <p>There is an existing footpath on the lower end of Roman Road and this should be continued in this area.</p> <p>I support a footpath as driving and walking along Roman Road is dangerous however believe it should be on the opposite side to the houses.</p>	<p>Support noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road.</p> <p>See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>
7.	Resident at Roman Road	<p>I believe the footpath would be better situated on the west side of the road as it would have less intrusion on the properties, be more cost effective and would not impact driveways or crossing Roman Way, West Road and Oak Road. It would also give drivers a better visibility of pedestrians, especially at night and help improve safety along the road.</p> <p>I would also like to raise concern over the narrowness of the entry on to Roman Road from Heath Roundabout and hope a slight widening could be provided at the same time as construction.</p>	<p>Support noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road.</p> <p>See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>



8.	Resident at Roman Road	<p>Having lived on Roman Road for over 30 years my comments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I am very much in favour of a footway, as pedestrian use has increased</li> <li>2) Footway would obviate there being pedestrians on both sides of the road at the same time, making it safer and less risk to vehicular traffic</li> <li>3) The footway would be better sited on opposite (A326) side of the road as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would be safer than pedestrians having to cross driveways and would be more convenient for residents access/egress of properties</li> <li>• Construction would be easier and more cost effective as would not involve maintaining access to properties</li> <li>• Rain water storage can readily be provided on A326 side in existing ditch</li> <li>• Obviates possible issues of public utilities in the construction.</li> <li>• Visibility distance for both drivers and pedestrians would be far better if footway is on outside of bend.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>Support noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road. See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>
9.	Resident at Roman Road	<p>From Oak Road to West Road there is a series of banks and ditches which residents have maintained since 1981. The ditches collect water from the road preventing puddles in the road which occurs near the roundabout where the ditches have been filled. The council has put in a pipe there but it bungs up with leaves.</p> <p>The hedges outside the houses reduce some of the constant traffic noise from the A326. It has worked well for years and also creates a country feel and encourages walkers, joggers and horse riders to use the road.</p> <p>If you are determined to install a pavement then the forest side of the road, similar to the southern end of Roman Road would be more practical. When we moved in 1981 there was a maintained path in the strip of forest land between Roman Road and A326.</p>	<p>Comments noted and the preference for a footway on the south-western side of the road. See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>
10	Resident at Oak Road, Hythe	<p>The indicative route is along the housing side of the road which would mean crossing the driveways with associated risks. Also the undulating nature of the path would be awkward for those using a pushchair, wheel chair and elderly persons.</p> <p>If the path is located on the opposite side it would be uninterrupted and be more useable.</p> <p>Visibility is better on the opposite side of the road of oncoming traffic and sight lines are improved should users need to step into the road to pass. The right hand bend outside 'Hollies' is blind if approaching from the property side.</p> <p>Construction costs would be reduced on the opposite side as it would be a single pathway and less need for dropped kerbs at each entrance being eliminated.</p> <p>Green verges by properties would not be damaged, these are maintained by the relevant occupiers and keeping ditches free to allow drainage of the road.</p> <p>The ditches are vital for drainage and prevention of flooding.</p> <p>Vegetation on the forest side can be cut back and sufficiently left to regrow and perform as a sound proof barrier (which it is not currently doing as it has</p>	<p>Support noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road. See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>

		<p>overgrown and thinned at the base).  There used to be a path on the forest side in the middle of the green strip and became unusable due to lack of maintenance. Please reconsider the path position on the opposite side of the road to the houses.</p>	
11	Resident at Roman Road	<p>Object to the proposal on the housing side of the road for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I will have to cross this footpath when driving into/out of the driveway and being on the bend of Roman Road means it will be difficult to see pedestrians on the footpath.</li> <li>- I have a concrete pull-in outside my property which is part of my boundary, I will be unable to use this if the footpath goes ahead.</li> <li>- The ditches are also required for drainage.</li> </ul> <p>I am not against the footpath being on the opposite side of the road.</p>	<p>Objection to a footway on the north – eastern side of the road noted.  No objection to a footway on the south-western side of the road only.  See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>
12	Resident at Roman Road	<p>We strongly oppose the siting of the footpath on the housing side for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would entail filling ancient ditches and banks which are a feature of the properties</li> <li>• Removing ditches may create drainage issues</li> <li>• Many houses water stop-cocks are situated in the ditch or banks and would need to be relocated</li> <li>• Each property would require a dropped kerb, therefore increase costs</li> <li>• Indented kerbs may lead to surface runoff into properties as there are no drains in the roads</li> <li>• Raised pavements may lead to excess standing water in the road because there are no drains</li> <li>• The large hedges along boundary lines would need to be maintained</li> <li>• Most of the foot traffic is along the entire length of Roman Road North therefore siting the footway on the opposite side of the road would be safer as it would require crossing less roads.</li> <li>• It would be sensible to continue the line of the footpath already installed in Roman Rd South and for which provision has recently been started by the roundabout.</li> </ul> <p>We strongly urge you to reconsider the position of the footpath.</p>	<p>Objection noted.  See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>
13	Resident at Roman Road	<p>The indicative route is along the housing side of the road which would mean crossing the driveways with associated risks. Also the undulating nature of the path would be awkward for those using a pushchair, wheel chair and elderly persons.  If the path is located on the opposite side it would be uninterrupted and be more useable.  Green verges by properties would not be damaged, these are maintained by the relevant occupiers and keeping ditches free to allow drainage of the road.  The ditches are vital for drainage and prevention of flooding.</p>	<p>No objection noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road.  See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>

		<p>If the path is on the opposite side it is possible to drain into the old ditch currently hidden from view. Please reconsider the path position on the opposite side of the road to the houses as in Roman Road south.</p>	
14	Resident at Roman Road	<p>There is no doubt a pavement is required along Roman Road between Nash Road and Beaulieu Road particularly due to the number of pupils walking along the road. Pavement on the housing side means pedestrians, primarily pupils, have to cross three junctions when walking along its length, it would be continuous on the other side. According to our deeds our property runs to the edge of the existing road and a section of verge has been used as a gravel layby between our property and the road since before 1978. How will this be affected? Will the natural drainage be adversely affected?</p>	<p>Support noted for a footway on the south-western side of the road. It is understood that the verges are highway land however this will be checked with Hampshire County Council's records. See also responses to 1 and 2 above.</p>
15	Resident at Roman Road	<p>Why is a footpath being proposed? Foot traffic is very light there and to our knowledge there have been no safety issues concerning pedestrians The Local Authority is proposing to spend a lot of money on something no one has asked for and no money on problems everyone is concerned about. A footway was built on Roman Road South but on the west side, why is it on the east side in Roman Road north? Due to property accesses on this side it will be a potential safety hazard and increased cost for dropped kerbs and possible realignment. There is practically no drainage on the east side, will this be included if the footway is built? Ditches outside of the houses, which are maintained by residents, may be affected, these must be retained for water to drain away. What will happen to the verges? The road is narrow and it is difficult to see how the footway can be built without use of verges. We do not wish to lose our verge. West side of the road used to have a wide grass verge and footway/bridleway and ditch. Due to poor maintenance trees and bushes encroach on the edge of the road and footpath/bridleway is inaccessible. One of the biggest issues on Roman Road North is the unofficial carpark near the roundabout. It used to be a natural shrub area prior to the construction of the roundabout when it was used by contractors for storage of machinery and materials. It was never returned to its previous use and has now become a car park used by commercial vehicles (frequently parking overnight) and dog walkers parking before crossing the A326 to the forest, this affects traffic flow and creates extra noise through stop start traffic. The car park is a hazard to vehicles coming from the roundabout and the gravel is dragged onto the roads and blocks the drains. Resulting in flooding and expensive clear outs. We believe the footway is unnecessary, expensive and creates issues regarding safety, drainage, residents' driveways verges and privacy.</p>	<p>Objection noted.  This consultation is primarily on the principle of a footway along this section of Roman Road in order to assess if a scheme at this location is to be added to a list of transport schemes for the New Forest District for possible future implementation. No funding has been identified for its implementation.</p>

		We suggest NFDC abandon this idea and use the money on getting rid of the car park and returning it to its natural state and asses the vegetation on the west side of Roman Road north and reduce/cutback to open up the verge.	
16	Resident at West Road	<p>Firstly, I wholeheartedly agree that there is a real need for a designated footpath along this stretch of Roman Road. I walk this route daily and sometimes twice daily to get around the area, and have been concerned at the closeness, behaviour and speed of the traffic (vehicles and cycles) using this road. This is a regular route to various schools and college, used by many children and students, as well as numerous leisure users (dog walkers, Nordic walkers, hikers and ramblers) to gain access to the various crossing points over the main road to the heath and forest beyond. During the last year, I have noticed an increasing number of people with wheelchairs and pushchairs needing to use it, and the traffic does not always take care when going past. So this scheme is definitely needed and soon, please.</p> <p>However, I can see many problems with it being on the housing side:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All along the stretch, run-off ditches have had to be dug into the verges. If a footway is installed here, these would have to be filled in to give a flat and level surface. What would happen to the run-off from the gardens and the road? Mud and debris would probably be deposited on the footway, causing a hazard to pedestrians using it, unless you put in drainage at the property boundaries to take it away. This scale of work will be extremely expensive and problematic.</li> <li>2. The vegetation and trees that would need to be cut back or removed would be an enormous task. Who would pay for the work? Where exactly is the boundary line to each property? Who would maintain it and how much would it cost on-going? I have spoken to several residents along the stretch and they don't want their boundary hedges, shrubs and trees cut back severely or removed, as they act as extra sound barriers to counteract noise from the main road. It would also have a detrimental effect on the visual appearance of the lane and also a loss of some habitat for wildlife. I can foresee that it would be difficult to force owners to comply with your requirements or even allow you to do the necessary.</li> <li>3. The verges and edges of the road are loose and crumbling with pieces breaking away very easily. You have just repaired two sections the week before last which revealed that the underlying base of the tarmac is not good. There would need to be a lot of ground work done to give the required strength and support under the footway, especially with ditch filling, drainage and stabilising the road edge.</li> <li>4. The footway should be lit. Where would the lighting be located? Power? There are a few lamps positioned on the other side of the road, which are not</li> </ol>	Support noted and for preference of a footway on the south-western side of the road.

	<p>very effective at present, so an upgrade would be needed to try to illuminate the proposed footway. Light pollution for residents who don't experience it now, would need to be considered if the light is brought nearer to them.</p> <p>5. The number of driveways would require the provision of dropped kerbs at each entrance. Who would have to pay? Usually homeowners have to, but some have already built out to the road already at their expense. Again, can you force them if you decide it is their liability? It must be more expensive to have a footway installed with numerous dropped kerbs, rather than a continuous flat stretch. Footway users sometimes have difficulty going up and down, and will choose a flatter option of using the road, which defeats the object of providing the facility. Also, with the pavement on this side, it would bring the user nearer to the emerging vehicles, causing a possible conflict which does not usually occur at present.</p> <p>There are many advantages to creating the footway on the opposite side:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ground does not present the problem of the ditches, drainage and driveway issues. It is also fairly level and accessible.</li> <li>2. The vegetation is not so dense and looks easier to take back for the scheme to be accommodated and for the on-going maintenance that would be required. Also, I would imagine that the ownership of the land required is not in private ownership, but publicly held, even though I know that has inherent legal problems sometimes, gaining the relevant permissions, etc.</li> <li>3. Lighting which would be needed is already established on this side, even though not adequate. Any necessary upgrade would be easier to carry out, with the power and cabling in place and would be less expensive than the cost of a brand new cable, etc. being installed on the other side. Street lighting is also accepted in the street scene, so would not cause significant additional nuisance to residents if increased, as long as their boundary planting was not reduced significantly.</li> <li>4. Roman Road South has already had the footway installed and it works very well sited opposite the houses. Many residents, myself included, use that stretch regularly, and feel a lot safer being separated from the traffic and also from emerging vehicles.</li> <li>5. There would also not be the need for numerous dropped kerbs, having no driveways emerging, although there would need to be some provision for those needing to cross at the road junctions. This would lead to a lower cost, especially as it would be quicker, easier and cheaper to lay a longer, flatter stretch of aggregate, kerbing and tarmac, rather than stop/start. Again, it would be easier and safer for someone pushing a wheelchair, pushchair or walking without too many up and down manoeuvres.</li> </ol> <p>To conclude, I and other residents and users I have spoken to, would very much</p>	
--	--	--

		welcome the provision of this footway along this stretch of Roman Road North, but not on the residential side. The opposite side presents a much easier, less legalistic, less expensive and time consuming option for this much needed facility.	
17	Resident at Roman Road	<p>I write to register my strongest objection to the proposal. The proposal is unwarranted, will spoil the rustic appearance and character of the area and is an expense the Council could do without. I respectfully contest any safety grounds for the proposal – I've walked my dog along Roman Road for many years in all weathers and darkness and never had a problem with traffic. Pedestrian traffic is light and as it is straight, sight lines are good.</p> <p>What is intended for the verges outside the houses? The road is narrow and it is difficult to see how the footway can be built without using the verges maintained by residents. I have no wish to lose my verge.</p> <p>A footpath was built on Roman Road South (western side), why is one proposed on the east side on Roman Road North? The footpath will have to cross many properties driveway access so the dips required will be expensive and there is potential for pedestrian safety hazards. Consideration of drainage is required and NFDC will need to install drains at huge expense.</p> <p>The west side of Roman Road North used to have a wide grass verge with a footway/bridlepath and ditch beyond. Due to lack of maintenance it is no longer accessible, I suggest money be spent on this issue rather than unnecessary and unwanted pathways.</p> <p>Another issue is the unofficial car park near the A326 roundabout. It used to be a natural shrub area prior to the construction of the roundabout when it was used by contractors for storage of machinery and materials. It was never returned to its previous use and has now become a car park used by commercial vehicles (frequently parking overnight) and dog walkers parking before crossing the A326 to the forest, this affects traffic flow and creates extra noise through stop start traffic. The car park is a hazard to vehicles coming from the roundabout and the gravel is dragged onto the roads and blocks the drains. Resulting in flooding and expensive clear outs.</p> <p>In summary I suggest NFDC abandon this idea and use the money on getting rid of the car park and returning it to its natural state and to assess the vegetation on the west side of Roman Road north and reduce/cutback to open up the verge.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>This consultation is primarily seeking views on the principle of a footway along this section of Roman Road in order to assess if a scheme at this location is to be added to a list of transport schemes for the New Forest District for possible future implementation. No funding has been identified for its implementation.</p>
18	Resident at Roman Road	Firstly I would like to lodge a formal complaint re the way we were notified of this proposal, as per any other planning change or proposal all residents should have been notified of this proposal individually in writing not putting on spurious	This is an initial consultation to gauge whether there is support for the scheme by users of the route. Posting notices on site

		<p>lamp posts with little or no relevant information.</p> <p>Continuing on from that theme as we are now in the 21st century, details should have been available on that notice with a link to the proposal and more details on the NFDC website.</p> <p>Having lived at this address nearly 22 years we have noticed increasing traffic and speeds as people are using this road as a rat run to schools and Challenger way avoiding the chaos in Dibden Purlieu which you have created with indiscriminate parking on both sides approaching the village, the yellow lines have made this worse.</p> <p>The principal for this footpath is commendable as many children use this road (ours used too) to go to school but why was this not done at the same time as the Heath side? or even before?</p> <p>We believe the precedent has been set on the Heath Hotel of Roman Road with the pavement on the West side i.e. opposite side to Housing, thus allowing the road to remain the same size also allowing clear line of sight down the whole road and the ability of vehicles to see pedestrians also, this will not be the case on the housing side.</p> <p>We believe if as per your proposal having the pavement the housing side will reduce the road size thus increasing danger to vehicles and pedestrians and increase the potential for accidents to pedestrians with vehicles exiting their drives.</p>	<p>is considered the best way to achieve this as not all users of the path are residents. The site notices included a link to the website and plans were available on the NFDC website together with paper copies at NFDC offices.</p> <p>Support for the scheme is noted. This consultation is primarily seeking views on the principle of a footway along this section of Roman Road in order to assess if a scheme at this location is to be added to a list of transport schemes for the New Forest District for possible future implementation. No funding has been identified for its implementation.</p>
19	Cllr Malcolm Wade	As the County Councillor and a local NFDC Councillor I fully support the below four schemes as needed for the local community for road and pedestrian safety.	Support noted.
<b>DECISION: Add scheme to list</b>			

Scheme Proposal: HY/T/85 - **Hythe Road / Main Road:** provision of enhanced pedestrian safety and facilities at bus stops together with speed reduction features.

Reason for scheme: The proposal is to improve the bus stop facilities as well as provide some speed reduction features to encourage use of public transport and speed reduction features can encourage cycling in the area. This will encourage non car travel in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 12.

	<b>OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>Summary of comments received and Officer Response</b>
1	Cllr Malcolm Wade	As the County Councillor and a local NFDC Councillor I fully support the below four schemes as needed for the local community for road and pedestrian safety.	Support noted.
<b>DECISION: Add scheme to list</b>			

Scheme Proposal: HY/T/86 - **School Road:** provision of widened footway along School Road to assist pedestrians and those with mobility issues.

Reason for scheme: The aim of the proposal is to enhance pedestrian safety and encourage walking to/from the school and town centre. This will encourage non car travel in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Local Transport Plan Policy Objectives 7 and 12.

	<b>OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>Summary of comments received and Officer Response</b>
1	Cllr Malcolm Wade	As the County Councillor and a local NFDC Councillor I fully support the below four schemes as needed for the local community for road and pedestrian safety.	Support noted.
2	Helen Owers Hythe Parish Council	The plan looks like it meets all the issues raised. If you could keep me posted as to progress I would be grateful	Support noted.
3	Barry Armstrong	Thank you for your plan showing the footway improvements. The proposals look good and are as we discussed on site.	Support noted.
<b>DECISION: Add scheme to list</b>			



Scheme Proposal: HY/T/87 - **Ferry Road**: extension of parking layby.

Reason for scheme: The aim of the proposal is to improve the parking layby as currently parked vehicles extend into the carriageway and force traffic to cross over the centre line. This will improve safety on the highway in accordance with Local Transport Plan Policy Objective 1.

	<b>OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>Summary of comments received and Officer Response</b>
1	Cllr Malcolm Wade	i) As the County Councillor and a local NFDC Councillor I fully support the below four schemes as needed for the local community for road and pedestrian safety.	i) Support noted.
<b>DECISION: Add scheme to list</b>			

## **FORDINGBRIDGE**

*Addition to Schemes List - New Scheme Proposal*

Scheme Proposal: FO/T/19 – **Burgate School area**: Traffic management measures to improve safety at school drop-off/pick-up times, comprising waiting restrictions, a Prohibition of Driving Order and footway improvements.

Reason for scheme: The proposal is to improve the bus stop facilities to relieve parking pressures within the school site and encourage use of public transport. Waiting restrictions are also proposed with the aim of preventing the road becoming blocked by parked vehicles and in part make the area more welcoming for pedestrians and cyclists.

	<b>OBJECTOR / SUPPORTER</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>TRANSPORTATION OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b>
1	Operations Manager - Ringwood / Lymington Depot (Wilts and Dorset Bus Company)	SUPPORT: I am pleased this is going ahead as we have struggled with parking and the use of the bus by cars causing buses to load on the A338 as they cannot enter the bus stop.	Support noted.
2	NFDC Parking Officer	SUPPORT: All makes sense to me and what was discussed as the best solution at the meeting at the school three months ago.	Support noted.
3	Cllr Roxanne Bellows - NFDC	SUPPORT: This seems to be the best solution for the ongoing traffic issues at the Burgate school.	Support noted.

4	Resident - Burgate Fields	<p><b>OBJECTION:</b> Presumably you intend to create even more of a traffic hazard in Burgate Fields itself? At present, at 'picking up' time it is very often inconvenient and dangerous in our road due to the parked vehicles and emergency vehicles would certainly have problems at that time of day in reaching their destinations urgently and timely. We have vehicles parked associated with the infants/junior through the snicket following the adjustments you made a while ago in that area!</p>	<p>The proposal will provide additional parking for school transport which will relieve parking pressures within the school site. To ensure access to the parking area, on the spur of the road between the turning circle and the A338 bus layby is not impeded, parking in front of the proposed gates will need to be restricted to make the new parking area accessible, this will result in the loss of approximately 6 spaces. However the benefit of the provision of more orderly school transport parking is considered to outweigh the dis-benefit of the loss of those spaces.</p> <p>There are understandable concerns about parking on roads near local schools. Parking in the access road to Burgate School and nearby residential roads may not just be school parking. Some "car-share" related commuter parking is also suspected. A parking survey is planned to help identify the level of parking activity in the area. This would help the Council decide if more on-street parking management should be considered. It is desirable for there to be no parking in front of the southernmost gate, however this parking proposal and others in the area are subject to a separate statutory consultation process and a separate decision will be made on this shortly.</p>
5	HCC Safety Engineering	<p><b>NO OBJECTION:</b> No comments as such from Safety Engineering. We have checked the safety record and there are no reported injury accidents in the area shown on the map attached to your website in the entire database going back to January 1990.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
6	HCC Children's Services in Outdoor Education	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b> Any proposals to improve the bus routes has to be good news – but the biggest issues are the number of parents collecting by car that effectively turns the road running alongside the perimeter of the school into a one way route when buses and other cars are needing to turn around and exit. Therefore the passing places are good.</p> <p>Whilst it is good in theory to stop people parking at the exit of the school and along that lane to facilitate two way traffic – they will still need to park somewhere and it is not clear where they are expected to go instead – potentially the knock on will be to the residential areas</p>	<p>Management of on-street parking is discussed at regular meetings between HCC and NFDC Councillors and representatives of the Town Council. Proposals suggested by interested parties are discussed and if supported progressed to public advertisement. Responses are carefully considered before advertised proposals are implemented.</p> <p>The assessment and provision of onsite parking is a matter for the school and, when planning applications for the site are submitted, the Local Planning Authority</p>

		adjacent to the school which might stop one problem but create others. I would like to see an assessment of the number of cars which collect daily and a plan for where they will be expected to go if their current parking areas are restricted.	(NFDC) in consultation with the Highway Authority (HCC).  See 4 above regarding an on-street parking survey and the possibility of more on-street parking management.
7	NFNPA Access Forum	<b>NO OBJECTION:</b> It might alleviate the situation if enough parking were provided inside the school grounds for the non-teaching staff most of whom have to park outside by the gates thus adding to the problem before and after school.	The assessment and provision of onsite parking is a matter for the school and, when planning applications for the site are submitted, the Local Planning Authority (NFDC) in consultation with the Highway Authority (HCC).
8	Resident - Burgate Fields	<b>SUPPORT:</b> I agree wholeheartedly with this. Some students park in the road all day, parents use Burgate Fields to drop off and pick up pupils at the adjacent infant and junior schools (there are already parking restrictions around these schools and no drop off points). Parents seem to turn up early to be able to park. Apparently some young children have to walk unaccompanied along the path as the person meeting them is unable to park at the school gates. A substantial minority of pupils are unable to walk or access transport to get to school. Sixth formers sometimes travel particularly long distances so drop off points and parking are required. I estimate that this plan will result in the loss of approximately 12 places on the road currently used for parking. I also think further consideration should be given to the proposed changes and their effect on the adjacent schools and residents living near. I am however unsure if this is a matter for the Laf.	Management of on-street parking is discussed at regular meetings between HCC and NFDC Cllrs and representatives of the Town Council. Proposals suggested by interested parties are discussed and, if supported, progressed to public advertisement. Responses are carefully considered before advertised proposals are implemented. See response 4 above regarding an on-street parking survey and the possibility of more on-street parking management.  The assessment and provision of onsite parking is a matter for the school and, when planning applications for the site are submitted, the Local Planning Authority (NFDC) in consultation with the Highway Authority (HCC).
9	Resident - Burgate Fields	<b>OBJECTION:</b> I can understand that safety will and should always take priority, though the scheme also refers to improvements to parking provision. So removing cars from what are regarded as dangerous places is good, but I don't see where the displaced cars will go. They only currently utilise dangerous places because they have no better option. Parking is overall totally inadequate for drop off / pick up, so much so that residents at the entrance to their estate and beyond are inundated with the overflow. I would say that these cars are also a safety hazard since they take-up so much of the narrow road that emergency vehicles might not be able to get through.....and this is the current situation! Based upon your drawing, I can't see where the cars displaced from the approach to the school entrance will be able to go, except to further bung-up the residential roads of the estate. Seems to me that there's not enough space available to cope with the number of	The scheme is primarily aiming to find a solution for the parking of buses (both school and public buses) as well as trying to alleviate the congestion by the school. The bus company has commented that they frequently struggle to park and enter the bus stop as cars are parked there causing the bus to load on the A338.  Provision of additional parking is not encouraged as it will promote more trips to the school by private car rather than by more sustainable methods such as by bus, walking and cycling. The assessment and provision of onsite parking is a matter for the school and, when planning applications for the site are submitted - the Local Planning Authority (NFDC) in consultation with the Highway Authority (HCC).

		<p>cars however you decide to reconfigure things. The school has plenty of land laid to grass, so I would have thought the ultimate solution lies there.</p> <p>Why there are no parking restrictions (except to short sections on bends) along this section of the road through Burgate Fields, frankly bemuses me. This is the real safety issue in the area. Parking away from the kerb and a house fire on the other side, and you have a recipe for tragedy. In the context of the holistic approach to parking in the area, I would seriously suggest that this aspect is examined also.</p>	<p>The proposed waiting restrictions are aimed at preventing the road becoming blocked by parked vehicles and hopefully also make the area more welcoming for pedestrians and cyclists. The short section of proposed waiting restrictions on the western side is to ensure a safe passing place is available at all times. The waiting restrictions may displace some parking however will not prevent people dropping off children on the approach road towards the school gates as vehicles may stop to load/unload or while passengers board or alight. (See response to 4 above regarding on-street parking survey and the possibility of more on-street parking management.)</p> <p>There is limited funding to make changes and this option was considered by the school and Town, District and County Councillors and was considered appropriate with the funding available. The benefit of the provision of more orderly school transport parking was considered to outweigh the dis-benefit of the loss of some of the on-street parking opportunities. Management of on-street parking is discussed at regular meetings between HCC and NFDC Cllrs and representatives of the Town Council. Proposals suggested by interested parties are discussed and if supported progressed to public advertisement. Responses are carefully considered before advertised proposals are implemented.</p>
10	Resident - Burgate Fields	<p><b>OBJECTION:</b> The proposal has merit but is completely unacceptable without considering parking and traffic management measures for the residential spur of Burgate Fields. The proposal ignores half of the infrastructure around the school. It is quite obvious that it will cause the unintended consequence of displacing all day parking and an increase in "drop off / pick up" traffic into an even narrower, residential dead-end.</p> <p>Growth of school - increases the amount of drop off/pick up traffic, there has been a disproportionate increase in the numbers of cars parked all day around the school due to sixth form car usage. I have been in contact with the school on a number of occasions this</p>	<p>Management of on-street parking is discussed at regular meetings between HCC and NFDC Cllrs and representatives of the Town Council. Proposals suggested by interested parties are discussed and if supported progressed to public advertisement. Responses are carefully considered before advertised proposals are implemented. See 4 above regarding on-street parking survey and the possibility of more on-street parking management.</p>

		<p>academic year due to inconsiderate parking and cars which have been left unsecured.</p> <p>Restrictions in Pennys Lane area - There has been an increase in the amount of traffic at the end of the residential spur since the parking restrictions in Penny's Lane have been in force; parents walk their children along the path between houses in Burgate Fields and the perimeter of the secondary school. This has caused chaos resulting in residents putting up their own barriers to prevent vehicles turning in their driveways – one resident has put their property on the market due to exacerbation over inconsiderate driving, parking and alleged vandalism during drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>New Entrance Gate at southern corner - the new southern corner entrance gate came with a “school parking Zig- Zag”. This is persistently ignored (particularly on rainy days) as it is the most convenient place to be dropped off.</p> <p><b>Suggested remedies</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not go ahead with the scheme until traffic management in the residential spur has been considered and redressed.</li> <li>2. Remove the parking restrictions in the Penny's Lane area or impose the same restrictions in the residential spur of Burgate Fields.</li> <li>3. Introduce residential permit holder only parking in the Residential Spur of Burgate Fields.</li> <li>4. Enforce the parking restrictions</li> <li>5. Create adequate parking for Burgate School within its grounds and modify School Travel Policy in line with school growth.</li> </ol>	
11	Resident - Burgate Fields	<p><b>OBJECTION:</b></p> <p>Concerns relating to the proposals. NFDC refused the first plan for the original 6th Form Centre in 1993 because of concerns over impact to Burgate Fields and its residents. Citing unacceptable levels of disturbance and nuisance to occupiers of dwelling houses and inconvenience to local residents and have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of the area.</p> <p>Penny's Crescent and Penny's Close parking restrictions has resulted in parent drop-off/pickup parking in Burgate Fields. The Infant School head wrote to parents encouraging parents to “park responsibly slightly further out” from Penny's Close/Crescent, which increased the problem in Burgate Fields. In addition, congestion periods have been extended in Burgate Fields because cars are arriving earlier in order to get a</p>	<p>The proposed waiting restrictions are aimed at preventing the road becoming blocked by parked vehicles and in part hopefully make the area more welcoming for pedestrians and cyclists. The short section of proposed waiting restrictions on the western side is to ensure a safe passing place is available at all times. The waiting restrictions may displace some parking however will not prevent people dropping off children on the approach road towards the school gates as vehicles may stop to load/unload or while passengers board or alight. See response to no4 above regarding on-street parking survey and the possibility of more on-street parking management</p>

	<p>parking space. Vehicles park throughout the estate during morning and afternoon drop-off and parents escort children to school and so cars can be present for up to one hour (particularly evident in the afternoons). All day student parking exacerbates the problem and there have been incidents of public pathways being blocked, residents driveways obstructed, parking across dropped kerbs and obstruction of pavements.</p> <p>Damage has been caused to our privately owned and maintained residents green area with verge parking, and by delivery vehicles unable to pass without mounting the grass or pavements, additionally the need to back up causes further congestion, confusion and sometimes conflict. It is particularly worrying that emergency vehicles would find it impossible to access many of the 35 properties.</p> <p>The wooden dragon's teeth adjacent to the A338 have deterred verge parking, but will have increased parking elsewhere.</p> <p>The recent re-opening of the pedestrian school gate at the T-junction of Burgate Fields and school access road has resulted in more drop-offs at that busy area. We understood that the previous gate sited in this area was closed on safety grounds, so it was a surprise to see that it had been re-opened. This has increased congestion. Drivers appear unwilling, or unable, to drive up to the main gate turning area so attempt to turn in the T-junction area, or drive directly into Burgate Fields, using residents' private drives or the estate's inner close areas to turn. Burgate Fields residential area has effectively become the school drive-through.</p> <p>Permission for the last extension of the 6<sup>th</sup> form, raising the student numbers to 290, was granted in 2002 subject to a Travel Plan. We have searched for the Plan, but haven't found it. If it was submitted it appears to have been inadequate because, since the 6<sup>th</sup> Form centre was last extended, student vehicles have regularly parked on Burgate Fields. We now have 6-9 student cars regularly left parked in the residential part of Burgate Fields during term time.</p> <p>The gradual growth of the schools, local road parking restrictions in Penny's Close and Penny's Crescent, and school travel policies (or lack of) has made the situation progressively worse for the residents. This latest proposal for the bus stop parking and access will make it intolerable. Typically, on an average school day, there are 15 cars on the western side of the northbound approach road to the school gates, plus a further 20 cars (plus 1 mobile home), parked around the school gate turning area and packed into the cul-de-sac area proposed for the "bus- only" re-opened roadway. Most of these vehicles are parked <u>all day</u> in the proposed no parking areas, and will seek space elsewhere,</p>	<p>There is limited funding to make changes and this option was considered by the school and Town, District and County Councillors and was considered appropriate with the funding available. The benefit of the provision of more orderly school transport parking was considered to outweigh the dis-benefit of the loss of some of the on street parking opportunities. Management of on-street parking is discussed at regular meetings between HCC and NFDC Cllrs and representatives of the Town Council. Proposals suggested by interested parties are discussed and if supported progressed to public advertisement. Responses are carefully considered before advertised proposals are implemented.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>with Burgate Fields being the most likely target.</p> <p>One resident has sold up and is moving, we understand, because of damage and inconvenience. We too have experienced damage, when our front wall was demolished by a parent reversing into our neighbour's private driveway.</p> <p>We are further concerned about the impact on the value of our property as a result of the daily invasion which will almost certainly become worse if this proposal goes ahead as currently planned.</p> <p>Finally, the safety issues need to be addressed. The number of parked and moving cars in Burgate Fields residential area during school drop-off/pick-up times is causing blind spots and danger. Some of the students occasionally drive faster than many of us would consider safe and we also see cars reversing, having to back up to give way to oncoming traffic. This, combined with young children getting ahead of their adult escorts and sometimes running straight into the road from the designated pathways, or the resident's private green area, is a real safety risk which would be increased with the displaced additional parking caused by this scheme.</p>	
12	Fordingbridge Town Council	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <p>We have received representations from local residents and groups expressing concern over the proposals. Of particular concern are the resultant parking problems, particularly in Burgate Fields, which would occur if sixth formers are unable to park within the school car park. This will only increase frustration for local residents in that area, particularly since the closure of the Infant School Car Park for parents with Penny's Crescent, Lane and Close suffering increased congestion.</p> <p>The Council appreciate that measures will be put in place to help alleviate problems and Cllr Bellows informed Members at the Annual Council Meeting that increased parking provision was also being planned. Unfortunately, it will be almost impossible to educate either parents or pupils to act considerately and responsibly. Other measures planned are welcomed and it is essential that improvements are made in order to increase safety in the area.</p> <p>The Council would have welcomed earlier involvement in this scheme and would request inclusion in future projects at an earlier stage.</p>	<p>Support noted and NFDC is aware of the Burgate Fields residents' concerns and representations made. See 4 above regarding on-street parking survey and the possibility of more on-street parking management</p> <p>Support for the measures is noted and NFDC will continue to involve FTC in future projects. FTC representatives have been notified of this proposal from its inception earlier in 2014 and also highlighted support for it at a Traffic Management meeting held in early 2014.</p>
13	Resident - Burgate Fields	<p><b>OBJECTION:</b></p> <p>My concern is that if you make these changes then the parking outside my property will get even worse around 2.45pm to 3.15pm every</p>	<p>There are understandable concerns about parking on roads near local schools. Parking in the access road to Burgate School and nearby residential roads may not</p>

		<p>afternoon. I have been blocked out of my driveway on many occasions and people have parked in my driveway, and when you confront them they give torrents of abuse. Two or three cars a day ignore the double yellow lines and zigzag markings opposite my house. The proposals will make our lives even worse at school kicking out time. I have 2 suggestions.</p> <p>1 Open up the lay by at the north end and let all the traffic out that end creating a one way system even if it means a roundabout. Put a barrier across the entry to Burgate fields with access restricted to residents.</p> <p>2 Put restricted parking on the whole of Burgate fields with resident parking permits. This could be time controlled to coincide with the school kicking out time say 2.30 to 3.30</p> <p>This might seem extreme but it has come close to violence at times when people get aggressive when you ask them not to park there because you want to get out shortly. I have taken photos of cars parked on the yellow lines or zigzags and it's amazing how aggressive drivers get with you.</p> <p>Please consider if you lived here and what you would want done. This is a nice area to live if the parking issue could be sorted out properly.</p>	<p>just be school parking. Some "car share" related commuter parking is also suspected. A parking survey is planned to help identify the level of parking activity in the area. This would help the Council decide if more on-street parking management should be considered.</p>
14	Resident of Burgate Acres	<p><b>NO OBJECTION:</b></p> <p>My Client does not raise an objection in principle to the proposed traffic management scheme, but is concerned to ensure that access to his land is not adversely affected. As the scheme is currently drawn, south bound egress from the existing field gate would, in particular, be severely constrained. This is not acceptable. However, the issue can be overcome by including within the scheme the provision of a second field access close to the main access to Burgate Acres (the details of which will need to be agreed).</p> <p>I would be grateful to receive confirmation that the Council is prepared to amend the scheme of works as we propose.</p>	<p>The concern regarding the gated access has been addressed by minor modifications to the proposal. The objector, Cllr Roxanne Bellows; Cllr Ann Sevier; Cllr Edward Heron; Fordingbridge Town Council; Mandy Ware (HCC); Paddy Padfield (Burgate School) were consulted on the amended plan and raised no objections.</p> <p>Cllr Heron commented that the amended plans including a new field access is fine and that he continues to support the proposal but asked that the parking situation is continued to be monitored at peak school times and, should the situation deteriorate, consideration be given to further parking restrictions when next appropriate.</p>



**Consultees:**

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

Hythe and Dibden Parish Council; Cllr Malcolm Wade; Cllr Chris Harrison; Cllr Stan Wade; Cllr Maureen McLean; Cllr Maureen Robinson; Cllr James Binns; Cllr Malcolm Wade; Fordingbridge Town Council; Cllr Roxanne Bellows; Cllr Ann Sevier; Cllr Edward Heron.

Transport CAN Group, New Forest Access Forum, relevant technical officers from HCC and NFDC, Bluestar Buses, Wilts and Dorset Bus Company.

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