NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL’S TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY  
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VISION

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

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

STRATEGY AIMS

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

The Strategy Policies that relate to these aims are set out in Section 8.
NFDC Cabinet Approved 6 Dec 2006 and revision (Residents Parking) 4 Feb 2009.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 New Forest District Council, in partnership with Hampshire County Council (HCC) and others, has a key role with on and off street parking and traffic regulation. One of the District Council’s key targets for 2006/07 is the review of its Traffic Management Strategy. Another key target for 2006/07 is the evaluation of charging options for on-street parking within the District.

1.2 This Strategy sets out how the District Council plans to manage and co-ordinate the various linked functions it deals with, either in its own right or under the Agency Agreements it has with HCC. The policy framework will be set by the District Council for the functions it deals with in its own right. For the functions covered by Agency Agreement the policy framework is decided by HCC. The Strategy includes policies for the following:

- 1.2.1 Traffic Regulation (Agency function)
- 1.2.2 On-street car parking restrictions and enforcement (Agency function)
- 1.2.3 Public off-street parking (District function)
- 1.2.4 Residents’ Parking Schemes (District function within HCC policy framework)
- 1.2.5 Off-street Parking Charges (District function requiring HCC consent)
- 1.2.6 On-street Parking Charges (Potential Agency function)

1.3 Traffic regulation covers both moving and stationary traffic on the public highway (and in some cases on private land) and impacts on all road users. HCC is the local highway authority and, acting as their agent, the District Council undertakes a number of traffic regulation functions on their behalf. It has been agreed that initial enquiries relating to traffic management (except for motorways and trunk roads) should be directed to the District Council as their Agent. The Highways Agency is responsible for traffic management on motorways and trunk roads (e.g. M27 and A31) and this strategy excludes such roads.

1.4 Key stakeholders were consulted during Summer 2006 and it was approved by the District Council’s Cabinet on 6 December 2006.

1.5 The omission of area specific proposals is deliberate as these would need to be justified by survey data such as traffic flows, pedestrian counts, recorded injury accident information, traffic speeds and parking data. Recorded injury accident (RIA) information is kept for the whole area. Apart from RIA information and parking data, most other information is collected as required in connection with a specific issue. Given:

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

the reliability of any survey data collected at this time would be questionable. As parking patterns stabilise survey data will be collected and this will be used to develop area specific proposals that conform to the general policies set out in this Strategy.
1.6 The omission of detailed parking standards for new development in this strategy is also deliberate. Policy G1 refers. These standards will need to be included in the appropriate planning authority’s Local Development Framework and the preparation and adoption of these standards is covered by legislation and statutory regulation. The District Council is the Planning Authority responsible for the District excluding the National Park. The New Forest National Park Authority (NPA) is planning authority for the National Park area.

2 BACKGROUND

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

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

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

2.4 Under the agency agreement dated 20 August 2003 with HCC, the District Council exercises some traffic management/regulation functions on behalf of HCC in accordance with laid down procedures. Appendix 2 refers to the different types of traffic regulation orders (TROs). Advisory signs, traffic bollards and road markings are also used to influence the behaviour of road users. Measures to benefit particular groups or road users include residents parking schemes and disabled parking (legally enforceable and advisory). It also includes temporary road closures and other temporary Orders for special events or essential work within the highway. In practice NFDC makes most of the parking restrictions and all temporary road closures.

2.5 The District Council also has an agency agreement with HCC covering decriminalised parking enforcement dated 28 October 2005.

2.6 Other than through the development control process the District Council has a limited opportunity to influence how private non-residential car parks and car parks owned/administered by other authorities are managed other than through voluntary arrangements. However it is acknowledged that this is an important area of work and that there is a potential for partnership working that the District Council is keen to explore. Examples of private non-residential car parks include:
- Parking at visitor attractions
- Work place car parks
- Customer car parks (shopping centres/supermarkets)
- Railway Station/Wight Link Ferry car parks
- Crown Lands/Forestry Commission car parks
Public car parks (not operated by NFDC) – e.g. Totton
Town Council’s Civic Centre car park

2.7 A report “Review of Town Parking Clock and Charging Scheme” - http://www.nfdc.gov.uk/committeedocs/eprp/NFR91199.pdf (NFDC’s Economy & Planning Review Panel, 19 January 2005) considered the issues associated with the clock and charges scheme that operated from January 2003. It concluded that this scheme improved the opportunities to park in short stay spaces but had little impact on long stay parking. A revised charging scheme was subsequently introduced, details at http://www.nfdc.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=4976.

3. CURRENT SITUATION

3.1 The predominant mode of travel in the District is the private car (84% of households in the District have access to a car or van (2001 census). The accessibility maps recently provided by HCC demonstrate that many parts of the District are not at all well served by public transport.

3.2 Even if LTP aspirations regarding traffic management are met traffic is likely to grow at approximately 1% per annum.

3.3 The adverse impact of traffic is a concern for many communities. Identified concerns include:
- traffic speeds
- risk of injury
- community severance due to busy roads
- local roads not suitable for volume and type of traffic (e.g. lorries).

Please refer to the results of the Citizens’ Panel at Appendix 3. Where justified, (there is often detailed guidance available on this), appropriate traffic management measures can be introduced. The Department for Transport has recently produced guidance for the setting of speed limits, http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_rdsafety/documents/page/dft_rdsafety_612262.pdf. In some cases restrictions, such as lower speed limits, may be introduced but there is a high level of non complianc – 50% of vehicles in built up areas exceed 30 mph limit speed limit (link to report www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstats/documents/downloadable/dft_transstats_611476.pdf) so changing a speed limit may not reduce the speeds as hoped for. The availability of Police resources to undertake enforcement is an important consideration. In the case of speed related complaints, “community reassurance” is currently often undertaken (e.g. Police visit and/or speed indicator device deployment). HCC & the Police have a pilot “Speed Watch” scheme in part of the District.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatal (K)</th>
<th>Serious (S)</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>KSI in NFDC Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994/98 ave</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Casualty Figures for NFDC Area

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

Congestion and Traffic Related Air Pollution

3.7 The combined effects of congestion, closely spaced buildings and unfavourable topography can result in a build up of traffic related pollution. In some cases the pollution levels are above statutory limits. Lyndhurst and Totton include areas that are unfortunately examples of this. There is a statutory obligation to seek to improve air quality so that pollution levels do not exceed the set thresholds. Traffic related air pollution levels have resulted in the declaration of Air Quality Management Areas for parts of both Lyndhurst and Totton.
3.7 Even the most optimistic predictions are for traffic volumes to increase. This will increase congestion and, in some areas, reduce air quality. Congestion also results in increased costs for business and frustrates drivers generally. It is important that measures, such as parking restrictions, be considered so as to minimise avoidable delays on the main traffic routes.

3.8 A Highways Agency’s Regional Network Report for the South East (August 2006) refers to the M27 and A31. For the M27 congestion is currently a major issue at peak hours. For the M27 to the west of Junction 3 its current “observed stress level” is “90-100% stress”. For the A31 the current observed stress levels vary:
- “90-100% stress” for the majority of its length across the District
- “More than 100 stress” at Ringwood
By 2026 it is anticipated that the observed stress level for the whole of the M27 and all of the A31 through the District will be “more than 100%”. Drivers can be expected to increasingly look for less congested alternatives (already happens when there are incidents and/or road works on the A31).

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

Parking

3.11 The current off-street parking charges scheme, which includes the “parking clock”, was introduced in 2004. More information can be found at http://www.newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=1639.

3.12 NFDC manages 6487 off-street spaces. More information can be found at http://www.newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=1639

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

3.14 A survey of public attitudes in some Town Centres was undertaken by consultants in 2005/06. Please also refer to the results of the Citizens’ Panel at Appendix 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>% of Drivers Stating Able to Park in 1st Choice Location</th>
<th>Parking Very Good or Quite Good</th>
<th>Parking Very Poor or Quite Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LYMINGTON</td>
<td>In-street survey of shoppers</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business occupiers survey</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0% of the businesses considered the ‘availability and location of car parking’ to be an issue constraining their business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>In-street survey of shoppers</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON</td>
<td>Business occupiers survey</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.4% of the businesses considered the ‘availability and location of car parking’ to be an issue constraining their business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RINGWOOD</td>
<td>In-street survey of shoppers</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business occupiers survey</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.1% of the businesses considered the ‘availability and location of car parking’ to be an issue constraining their business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTTON</td>
<td>In-street survey of shoppers</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business occupiers survey</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% of the businesses considered the ‘availability and location of car parking’ to be an issue constraining their business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.15 The effects of introducing different pricing between long and short stay clocks have yet to be assessed through “length of stay”/car park occupancy/surveys. However, ad-hoc spot inspections do indicate more free spaces in long stay public car parks and residents have reported a limited increase in the amount of on-street parking in unrestricted roads. The numbers of clocks sold are shown in table 2. The current parking clock scheme has HCC consent up until the end of December 2007 and authorisation from HCC will be required to allow it to continue after then. The following is the link to HCC’s decision http://www.hants.gov.uk/decisions/decisions-docs/051011-exmrnh-R104135256.html.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004#</th>
<th>2005*</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Year</td>
<td>65,440</td>
<td>59,974</td>
<td>51,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Year (to 31st July)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Stay</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>46,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Stay / Mid Stay</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Clocks</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Additional off-street public parking

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

Environmental Issues and Partnership Working

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

3.20 Increased demand for on street parking means that parking occurs in undesirable locations. Verge erosion, minor obstructions to property accesses and inconvenience to other road users are affected by this.

4. VISION

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

4.2 This vision takes account of the policies and aspirations set out below.

4.3 Statement by the Leader of the District Council, Councillor Melville Kendal

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

5. STRATEGY OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

5.1 The agreed priorities for transport include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.3.4 Make more on-street parking available

5.3.5 To introduce charges for on street car parking.

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

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

5.3.8 Co-ordinate traffic management/regulation throughout the District

6. ASSESSMENT OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS (updated to reflect NFDC Cabinet decision 4 February 2009)

6.1 New Traffic Management (TM) proposals to be considered for assessment will normally come from:

6.1.1 Informal Local Members Traffic Management Liaison meetings

6.1.2 HCC/NFDC/Police Officers liaison meetings

6.1.3 HCC & NFDC Member meetings and New Forest Road Safety Council

6.1.4 Town & Parish Council’s meetings
6.1.5 Proposals identified in Local Development Framework documents

6.1.6 HCC Capital Works Programmes
6.1.7 List of developer funded schemes previously agreed in principle by HCC and NFDC and

6.1.8 Approved Village/Community Plans

6.2 Requests for TM measures from residents, Members and others that are likely to contribute towards the aims referred to below will normally be first channelled through either an Informal Local Traffic Management Liaison meeting or a HCC/NFDC/Police liaison meeting. TM measures that have strong support will be assessed against the following aims set out in this Strategy.

6.3 NFDC officers, in consultation with HCC officers and the Police, will assess proposals taking into account some or all of the following depending on the significance of the measure:

6.3.1 Data collection (e.g. traffic flows, speed checks, parking surveys, recorded injury accident information).

6.3.2 Technical assessment.

6.3.3 Financial assessment.

6.3.4 Environmental implications.

6.3.5 Views of local HCC and District Council Members

6.3.6 Results of non-statutory consultations

6.3.7 Responses to statutory consultations.

6.3.8 Reference to planning and policy documents (e.g. local urban design frameworks, local transport plan, local transportation strategies, HCC’s policies and procedures).

6.3.9 Government/National technical advice and guidance.

6.3.10 Level of “self enforcement” and level of Police/Local Authority enforcement required to make measure effective

6.4 Priority will be given to the implementation of advertised proposals and other proposals for which the detailed design has been completed (including TM proposals in agreed capital programme schemes) subject to:

6.4.1 The careful consideration of objections to advertised traffic regulation orders.

6.4.2 No unresolved objections from NFDC Ward Councillors and HCC Councillors.

6.4.3 No unresolved objects from HCC’s Director of the Environment’s representative.

6.4.4 Careful consideration of any objections from statutory consultees.
6.5 The other parts of the programme will include proposals that will most effectively contribute towards the aims referred to above having regard to:

6.5.1 The employee and financial resources available (costs of TM proposals in agreed HCC capital programme schemes will normally be funded from scheme budgets) including developers’ transport contributions.

6.5.2 NFDC Councillors and HCC Councillors views on the relevant priority of TM proposals within the area they represent.

6.5.3 The views of the Police, HCC officers and priorities of Town and Parish Councils and other stakeholders as appropriate.

6.6 Given the available HCC allocation (typically £18,000 per year) for works and the cost of traffic calming, pedestrian crossing facilities and highway improvement works (generally well in excess of the annual allocation) these and other proposals costing more than in the region of £3,000 will not normally be suggested for inclusion in the TM programme unless there is either partnership funding or developer funding available (list of developer funded schemes previously agreed in principle by HCC and NFDC following consultation with Town/Parish Councils and others).

6.7 To minimise advertising costs some proposals may be grouped together accepting that this could result some delays with implementation.

6.8 A Citizen’s Panel Survey was undertaken during September 2006. The results of this will be taken into account when relevant to the proposal. The full results are at www.newforest.gov.uk/citizenspanel. Extracts are set out in Appendix 3.

7. STRATEGY AIMS

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

Aim B - To improve road safety

Aim C - To minimise congestion

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

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

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

Aim G – To have parking standards for new development that take account of the characteristics of the area (excludes National Park)
**Aim H** – To set and review on and off street parking charges that are compatible with other strategy aims.

### 8. STRATEGY POLICIES

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

Unless otherwise stated below the initial contact point for enquiries, requests etc relating to the following traffic management topics is New Forest District Council (tel: 023 8028 5000; email: customer.services@nfdc.gov.uk) except for the maintenance/replacement of highway signs and markings please contact Hampshire Highways (tel: 0845 850 4422 e-mail: hampshirehighways.west@hants.gov.uk).

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

**Policies**

A 1 To optimise off street parking opportunities that meet the needs of people upon which the vitality of the local community depends through parking restrictions and charges for parking on-street and in public car parks.

A 2 To continue to improve the management of public car parks through charges and the retention of the current clock scheme

*Given the dominant mode of travel is by private car the vitality of local communities depends on adequate parking. However, not all parking activities result in benefits for the local community (e.g. public town centre parking used as park and ride car parks serving major employers outside the District). In some town centres etc. there is a legitimate need for local employee parking. However, if unrestrained, it could reduce the parking opportunities for customers. As a result parking regulations and charges needs to be framed so as to meet the essential parking needs of the community. This may involve discouraging parking that will not benefit the community. In the past the designation of short stay parking spaces has been the principal tool used to encourage a turnover of vehicles in NFDC’s town/village centre car parks. More recently parking charges have been set so as to contribute towards meeting policy objectives referred to above. The current parking clock scheme has HCC consent up until the end of December 2007 and authorisation from HCC will need to be sought for its retention. Charges for on-street parking in certain areas will be considered.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Aim B - To improve road safety

Policies

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

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

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

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

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

The District Council currently takes an active lead in multi-agency. NF Safer Roads Group organises a number of speed reduction initiatives. As referred to above, speeding traffic is often a major local concern with residents. Initial Contact Point: Police Traffic Management Officer (South West Area) Police Station, 390 Shirley Road, SHIRLEY, SO15 3UG Tel: 0845 045 4545 E Mail: traffic.management@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

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

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

Aim C - To minimise congestion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policies

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

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

E 2 To provide measures to assist people with disabilities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

E 6 To support Highway Authority (HCC) initiatives to remove unnecessary sign clutter.
Whist traffic management measures can have environmental benefits the visual intrusion of additional signs, lines, and coloured road surfaces needs to be balanced against the traffic management benefits. Increasingly “sign clutter” is being perceived as an issue and HCC are proposing pilots to remove unnecessary signs etc. It is therefore important that a realistic assessment of the traffic management and related benefits of new signs etc. is undertaken; especially “will the measure inform and change road user behaviour for the better”. Where new or existing signs are judged to be ineffective or unnecessary they should be removed with priority being given to environmentally sensitive areas.

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

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

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

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

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

Please see B1, B2, B3 and supporting text. It is readily accepted that “engineering” solutions alone will not tackle all road safety concerns. Education and changing the attitudes of road users is also very important. The New Forest Road Safety Council has a key role in this and the District Council will continue to collaborate to promote road safety awareness and tackle anti-social driving through targeted initiatives. Whilst one priority is human casualty reduction the unique character of the New Forest National Park depends on grazing by animals that are free to roam. This will be prejudiced if there are high casualty rates especially amongst stock animals. The Forest Speed Indicator Device initiative aims to reduce animal accidents.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policies
G 1 To review the District Council’s parking standards for new development taking into account:
- revised National and Regional Planning Guidance
- Hampshire County Council policy
- the characteristics of the District
- the availability of alternatives to the private car

for inclusion in the Local Development Framework.

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

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

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

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

**Policies**

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

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

NFDC GUIDELINES FOR ON-STREET RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES

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

1. Assess the need for residents parking by reference to HCC guidelines relating to existing parking in the street and availability of alternative parking;

2. Assess the practicability of a scheme, the type of scheme which would be appropriate and its acceptability in terms of effect on other streets, the proposed fee for a permit and whether visitors permits are necessary;

3. Carry out consultations on all aspects of the scheme to ensure the fullest possible understanding and agreement before formal advertisement of an order.

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

(a) the cost of implementing the scheme is met by the County Council

(b) the cost of operating and enforcing the scheme is met by the District Council with residents paying for permits (currently £25 per permit per year with annual inflation increase).

(c) The schemes are intended to give preferential on street parking benefit to residents who have use of a vehicle but no off street parking. Currently participating residents (concession not usually given to commercial or business premises) will be given exemption from “limited waiting restrictions” subject to the display of a permit. Thus participating residents have the opportunity to park for longer periods near their homes provided spaces are available. Shoppers, employees etc. can park subject to “length of stay” restrictions and availability of spaces. As parking pressures increase it is envisaged that alternative types of residents’ parking schemes will need to be considered on a location specific basis.

(d) Residents who have use of a vehicle but no off street parking are currently issued with permits on the following basis (may be the subject of a future review):
   - A resident with no off street parking within the curtilage of his/her property who lives within the scheme is eligible for one residents permit. If there are two residents who each own a motor car, motorcycle etc. (see below) then a maximum of two permits may be issued to the same address.
   - In cases of houses in multiple occupancy (as defined by Regulation 2 Council tax (Liability to owners) 1993) each resident will be considered individually.
A visitor’s permit can be issued to residents who do not own a vehicle and do not have parking within the curtilage of the property. Only one visitors’ permit will be issued to the same address. Arrangements for visitors’ permits are likely to be reviewed.

- Permits must be renewed each year.
- Permits can only be issued for motor cars, motorcycles and invalid carriages as defined under Section 136 of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984.
- The owner of a vehicle displaying a valid permit will be able to use any of the bays designated for permit use on the length of highway described above.
- The possession of a permit does not imply that a parking space will always be available within the area covered by the Scheme.

The following additional points need to be borne in mind:

(e) if there are no existing “limited waiting restrictions” then these will need to be introduced. In addition, “no waiting at any time” or “working day waiting restrictions” will be considered at the same time so as to minimise displacing parking to locations where it could be detrimental to road safety or cause environmental problems.

(f) Referring to 3 (i) below the Council will consider the proposals acceptable to the greater proportion of the residents if the number of those who support the proposals exceeds the number who do not and there is a good response rate (at least 50%).

(g) The following are guidelines. There will not be a departure from the general principles. However, they will be applied having regard to local circumstances, especially if the criteria are not met by only a small margin.

(1) ASSESSMENT OF NEED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(iv) “That the cost of implementing, operating and enforcing a Residents Parking Scheme is met either:-
(a) by the District Council
(b) by the County Council
(c) by the residents or
(d) that the cost of implementing is met by the County Council and the cost of operating and enforcing the scheme is met by the District Council or residents”.

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

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

An extensive consultation exercise will be required to advise residents of the detailed proposals including costs of permits and this guideline ensures that the County Council and District Council are conversant with the wishes of the majority of residents, thus avoiding as far as possible abortive advertising costs for the traffic order. This may result in modification to the proposals, or abandonment if no satisfactory acceptable scheme can be devised.

Following this stage the scheme, if promoted by NFDC, would be submitted to the HCC’s Director of Environment and the local HCC and NFDC Members for approval prior to advertisement. Any objections would be considered by the District Council before implementation.
APPENDIX 2

TYPES OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

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

**Temporary Restrictions or Prohibitions** (most commonly road closures)

Grounds for making temporary Notices and/or temporary Orders:
- Works on or near the road
- Likelihood of danger to the public or serious damage to the road
- Litter clearing and cleaning.

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

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

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

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

**TOWN POLICE CLAUSES ACT ROAD CLOSURES**

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

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