

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>1. I think the focus on public safety is important but unlikely to dissuade culprits who see the animals as cuddly and harmless. There needs to be more emphasis on explaining the harm to the health of the animals themselves. People may be more responsible if they believe that they are actually causing harm rather than benefitting the ponies etc. 2. As well as feeding/cuddling livestock it should be made clear that allowing dogs to chase/injure ponies etc is also an offence and subject to the same prosecution and penalties. 3. Signage to this effect is needed in all car parks, emphasising the focus on animal welfare.</p>
<p>1. Many visitors to the Forest and some residents of the area are entirely unaware that there is anything detrimental about feeding the livestock. Large signs are needed at the entrance roads into the Forest. 2. Orders mean nothing if there is no enforcement and no penalties.</p>
<p>1. To describe the removal of stock from the open lands of the Forest as negative is an enormous understatement. The effects, especially on the Flora, would be catastrophic. 2. Although responding as an individual I am involved in the Animal Accident Reduction Group (AARG) and would point out that feeding and petting is probably the greatest underlying cause of animal deaths on the Forest roads.</p>
<p>A kick from a pony can have life changing consequences for a child. People do not think the "do not feed the ponies" signs apply to them so sadly enforcement is the only way to protect both the public and the ponies.</p>
<p>A safe reporting scheme would be beneficial. Many [REDACTED] make camp in new forest car parks. They leave behind rubbish and allow their children to feed, climb on abuse the livestock. Along with tourists who feel that the new forest national park is a free petting zoo. There needs to be a way the concerned general public and local residents can take photos of the offenders, their number plates etc and send this to an email that is monitored. This would curb the need for the concerned to voice this to the offenders as many local residents have received abuse from offenders when trying to explain the damage they are causing.</p>
<p>A shame when ponies will get blamed if someone gets hurt. Increased risk of ponies getting injured on the road</p>
<p>A) I Think this Consultation process to date is open to challenge. i) The consultation questions are framed to encourage support of the PSPO. It is not an open consultation seeking opinions but only seeking support for the one proposal on the table. (See Yes Minister "you frame a question to get a desired response" -<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0ZZJXw4MTA">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0ZZJXw4MTA</a>). ii) The consultation has involved only those interest groups that have a concern for the animals, there has been no consultation with commercial sector/, Tourism - what Consultation has been undertaken with Parish Councils.? Does this go against the LGA Public Spaces Protection Orders Guidance for Councils. iii) Regarding the LGA PSPO Guidance - what other options have been considered. The Guidance states the Council should look to other alternatives. There is a passing reference to bylaws, could these be applied? B) The fine and potential criminal conviction is not proportionate, reasonable and the offence is not persistent by the same individual. i) A potential £1000 fine and criminal conviction is excessive reaction NOT PROPORTIONATE. Touching a pony, feeding it a carrot is wrong, but this is taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut. Even the £100/£75 fine will be beyond many people given the current economic situation. ii) UNREASONABLE Other PSPOs cover behaviour widely understood to be antisocial eg being drunk, defecating in public, intimidating people. Touching a pony, encouraged in some zoos, is an unusual offence which a person may reasonably not be aware of. We cannot read every sign we pass in the car. iii) The examples provided are single events this is not PERSISTENT behaviour by the individual. A person who persistently feeds ponies or refuses to stop - should be fined. You need to issue a yellow card before you issue a fine. C) This lacks clarification i) Will NFDC be fined (or will I?) because NFDC require that I leave discarded food in plastic bags outside my house where ponies roam. This is the only way my household rubbish is collected and my neighbours grass cuttings. ii) There is no clarity as to what campers are required to do to keep their food safe from ponies etc. How do you avoid a penalty fine? iii) How do you assess whether someone is likely to touch a horse? The likely to provision cannot be proved and should be scrapped. D) Costings and method of enforcement and desired outcomes have NOT been included in this consultation (Again I refer to the LGA PSPO Guidance for Councils) EG Costings for the additional/ replacement signage. How will wardens be paid for fining people, is there a conflict of interest between those who benefit and those who pay? What would be the measure of success? What does NFDC want to achieve?</p>
<p>Action is desperately needed. A big part of the problem is that the New Forest is promoted to the public as a free theme park. There are currently no penalties for people who do not respect the environment and treat it as a picnic park and petting zoo. The proposed penalties would be a small start, but far more comprehensive measures are needed to halt the destruction of the flora and fauna of a unique ancient environment.</p>
<p>Activity which increases the presence of ponies close to roads increases the risk of collisions.</p>
<p>PSPO should consider also including the feeding of cattle and pigs, in addition to the livestock already listed.</p>
<p>Again please ensure its enforced if it goes ahead.</p>
<p>Again the area could be bigger but I understand the difficulties this might bring about and hinder the introduction of PSPO2</p>
<p>Again, educate do not dictate. Making petting or feeding a potential criminal offence is draconian and will drive people away.</p>
<p>Again, three years is a start but this should be permanent</p>
<p>Agree in full</p>
<p>Agree with not feeding the animals but if one of them comes up to you then petting it is fine and should not be an issue whatsoever.</p>
<p>All good - But how will you identify who can as defined in article 8 - yes we know [REDACTED] Agisters but we dont know all 700 commoners who turn out - how might they identify themselves or someone else not assume an alias of being a commoner or his/her agent?</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

Along with the PSPO, consideration should be given to reducing the number of ponies and similar animals in the forest. Reducing the numbers would reduce the likelihood of interactions with people, as well as reducing some of the negative impacts that large numbers of animals can have (e.g. over grazing and preventing natural tree growth).
Although not an owner myself, I have seen first-hand the effects of ignorant feeding of friends' and neighbours' horses and ponies. Carrots and apples thrown in bucket loads onto the commons and even into paddocks, and life-threatening colic following. Terrifying for owners, and agonising for their horses and ponies.
An excellent idea but I'm not sure how you will police it. It's a bit of a mammoth task!
An excellent idea.
Animals should be allowed to roam. People park and stop all over the place to see and touch the animals. People need to be reminded to stop somewhere safe
Another tax by the fun police!! Get a grip!!!
Any prohibition must be accompanied by information informing visitors why the prohibition is necessary.
Any signage about restricting feeding and petting and the reasons for this will need to be more widespread than current warnings but since this is not always effective there do need to be financial penalties as a sanction. Methods for the reporting of incidents and actual enforcement of the prohibitions will undoubtedly be problematic but this should not be a reason for inaction.
Area around the [redacted] at Godshill always a problem with this type of behaviour from tourists (from [redacted] ?)
[redacted] living in the New Forest area I am staggered by the level of public ignorance about the harm that can be done by petting and feeding ponies, donkeys etc.. The old signs on posts at car parks prohibiting feeding of animals should be brought back to remind people not to do it.
As a Parish Council we agree with the introduction of PSPO No. 2 but are concerned as to how this is to be implemented. Will extra funding be available? Will posters be in car parks and at main entrances to the NP? Where will the full orders be publicised? Who will the authorised persons be? Those already employed by NP? Will volunteer Ambassadors be involved? How will the public recognise them and what training will be given to deal with unco-operative or aggressive visitors/locals. This order is needed but needs to be effective.
[redacted] I have seen a number of [redacted] injured by pigs, ponies, and donkeys without obvious provocations by [redacted]. Also 3 [redacted] killed in separate accidents with deer.
[redacted] I have advised many people of the dangers of petting and feeding the animals and while many people were unaware of the potential dangers of doing so, some individuals continue their behaviour and cause the animals to become a nuisance
As [redacted], we are conscious of the danger to livestock if they pick up and eat litter, including large quantities of fruit and veg and even grass cuttings which are sometimes fly-tipped. Perhaps a clause on this could be included.
As mentioned previously support the feeding ban but would prefer that petting and touching remain as advice based on animals being wild rather than an illegal act.
As someone who crosses the Forest between Woodgreen and Fritham every day I see people petting and feeding the ponies in the car parks and on the roadside (often on the busy and dangerous B3078) almost every day during the summer. No matter how you broach the subject most people will not listen. The worst thing of all is people feeding animals out of car windows in the road. People bring big bags of carrots specifically to feed the ponies.
As the traffic is greater now than when animals were first put out on the forest, certain roads should be fenced. [redacted] it is horrible when a pony is killed. The road from Hatchet pond to beaulieu could easily be fenced and the ponies still have access to bot areas via the pathway to furzey. Roger Penny way is notorious for stock being killed and again could easily be fenced .
As with PSPO No 1 there must be sufficient staff/rangers to robustly enforce the rules 365 days of the year. If this lawless behaviour is allowed to continue there will not be a New Forest as we know it as commoners will not put their ponies/donkeys/mules out and the architects of the New Forest will be lost and with it the history and ecological importance. Please ensure that there is in yer face signage on all main entrance cattle grids outlining the rules of entry to the Park, much the same as they have in the US and do away with the small signs which people so easily ignore.
As with PSPO No1, if there is no provision for policing this order then it is a waste of time. It will need to be policed to work.
Benefit from including the full district boundary
Can we have a mobile message triggered when you come into the forest (as you do when you enter another country) saying welcome but No feeding petting barbecuing.? Lots of visitors don't know
Can't come soon enough but worried it will be unenforceable as no one will do it. No police presence. Rangers always absent. Keepers doing their job
Clear signage and public education will be key to enforcement. Enlisting support from local organisations may also be useful.
Commoners also have a responsibility to fellow residents in the Forest to prevent them congregating. Agree with the PSPO but will be very hard to enforce.
Commoners are becoming increasingly concerned over the ongoing turnout of stock and the dreaded news that their animal is responsible for injuring someone due to habits learnt from people petting and feeding them. Some have started removing animals or moving locations to avoid conflict.
Complete waste of time and money
Define petting and feeding. There is often a need to remove ponies who are standing in the middle of the road often making physical contact is necessary. Equally a small treat as a bribe can get a really recalcitrant mare off the road. It would be a disaster if necessary pony moving were to risk prosecution
Despite signs you still see people, including parents with young children, standing much too close to ponies. It encourages animals to go on the road.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

Dogs not under control, bothering livestock. Walking dogs through herds with youngsters. Why SHOULD the cattle be de-horned if the people are the problem? Verge parking. People stop on the roads to feed the donkeys from their cars. Cars speeding on the Forest, used as a rat run, particularly around blind bends. Not just about livestock, but could be a child on a bike/pony. Chinese lanterns should be banned from the area. So dangerous to a tinder dry area, out buildings and hay etc...
Double penalty for feeding from vehicles as this encourages animals on to roads.
Duration should be indefinite subject to periodic review
Education to the outside areas is most important.
Enforcement will be an issue. I walk in the Forest on a regular basis and very seldom do I encounter any official who would be able to enforce this Order. Perhaps trained volunteer "eyes" are required to assist in observing offences and advising officers. Perhaps a rota of volunteers stationed at carparks at busy times would give some visibility of enforcement measures. Perhaps this can be raised at the forthcoming [REDACTED]. Publicity and notices are not sufficiently prominent --- those that are at Car Parks are invariably faded and unreadable. An explanation of WHY petting and feeding is prohibited and the CONSEQUENCES should be better publicised --- eg a copy of the NF code given out to customers at Hotels, Camp Sites, Bike Hub and made available at pubs, cafes, etc
Ensure there is enough signage and that it is actually enforced.
Far too many animals on the forest end of
Feeding & handling the wildlife makes them more aggressive over time, it also draws them to people, making them stay near car parks & busy roads, this can lead to more car related injuries to the animals
Feeding and petting of New Forest ponies, horses, mules and donkeys can cause harm to our local animals; through disruption to their diet, negative health effects of feeding them food and over reliance on humans for food. Feeding the animals also encourages these free-roaming livestock to look for food by wandering close to roads and car parks in search of human visitors where they may be killed. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is dangerous for the animals, the financial impact on their owners is also worthy of consideration. Furthermore, there is risk to people and children in the community as these ponies associate people with food, approach these visitors and may potentially become aggressive. The evidence suggests that there is sufficient reasoning to support the proposed PSPO, in order to protect both the animals, visitors and the local community.
Feeding ponies encourages them to the roadside where they are in danger of being killed and where members of the public may also be killed or injured.
Feeding such animals near roads and car parks creates risks to the animals and to the public because the animals come to associate cars with food. They may also be given totally unsuitable food.
Feeding the ponies presents a serious risk to the ponies themselves. There have been cases of ponies being given inappropriate food causing health problems and possible death. Feeding also encourages ponies to seek out food from visitors and there is then a risk that they become intrusive and aggressive. It should be made quite clear that the ponies are owned by commoners and that no visitor should be allowed to give food to a pony that belongs to someone else.
Feeding the wild animals of the New Forest will cause them harm therefore the PSPO No.2 should be imposed.
Feeding, This is well publicised and should be strongly enforced from the start. Petting, Some animals approach people, which encourages petting, I have been approached and had animals around me, with no encouragement on my behalf. If enforcement is too harsh for petting only it could prove detrimental. Potentially if they are not expecting food, they may not approach.
Feeding/petting of the ponies etc encourages them towards roads and car parks where they are in danger themselves and also can cause danger to the public. These are feral animals - the New Forest is NOT a petting zoo!
Fines should be increased
Forestry England is getting more and more power mad by the week. Continuing efforts to introduce more restrictions, being it about barbeques, horses and related species, cyclists, and even model aeroplanes. I suspect Forestry England has a special department who's only function is to dream up new restrictions. And fines/penalty notices won't work. Unless you can 'connect' (for example a car registration to its owner or 'operator' via the DVLA) and the supposed 'offender' refuses to give his name and address, which he is legally entitled to do then Forestry England is powerless. And in many cases a car is not involved so this connection cannot be made. The ONLY time a supposed 'offender' has to give their name is when he appears before a court. Not even the police have a legal power to force you to give your name. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and have lived there ever since. The 'freedom' we had then has been progressively reduced over that period. FOR HEAVEN'S SAKE GIVE IT A REST. Accept that people can be foolish and some may light barbecues in unsuitable places, pet or feed animals, and so on. Attempting to 'fine' them is often impractical so equally foolish and just creates ill-will. And since Forestry England seems to have taken over from the Forestry Commission such pointless bureaucracy (such as asking us to reply to several separate surveys when one would have served just as well) has got worse and worse while solving nothing.
[REDACTED] Brockenhurst, I have views over an area frequented in term times by students, and at holiday times by many visitors. Some, not all, students use the area for picnics and other 'recreational' reasons and litter is a problem. Food litter, especially packaging, can be a hazard to animals. It needs to be included in any regulations being introduced. It is mainly residents who keep the area tidy, by regular litter-picking. Despite notices liberally displayed, many visitors cannot resist petting and feeding the animals. On several occasions I have seen parents attracting animals with food, and then trying to sit young children on ponies donkeys to get that cute holiday photo. Crazy! PSPO2 is needed, unfortunately, but will it ever be adequately promoted, and as required, enforced? You can pass whatever governance you like, but without resources for implementation, it will be a waste of time.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

Further education on the impact of petting and feeding animals on the forest. Increased signage is needed at car parks and national park entry points. [REDACTED] Canada's national parks I feel that the New Forest should take a leaf out of their book with increased rangers and bigger and better signs so it is impossible to miss. Perhaps more visitor centres at the major routes in so visitors can learn about the way of life of the forest too
Gentle education has not worked. These measures are urgently needed.
[REDACTED] The protection of the New Forest ponies, horses, mules or donkeys means that our unique Commoning heritage can be preserved for the future, and everyone can enjoy the Forest, whether they live here, work here or visit here in a way that's responsible, and in a way that preserves it for the future. It is important to the economy and the reputation of our destination, that we are seen as a welcoming destination. The New Forest ponies are a huge attraction to both visitors and residents, and education and guidance must always be a priority in preventing, or addressing, any act or behaviour which is detrimental to the welfare of the Forest animals and the wider community. Many visitors have little or no understanding of ponies, or how the feeding of them can make them aggressive and a danger to the public safety. Neither are they aware that the feeding of the animals can be extremely harmful to the welfare of the animal and have a serious impact on the owners. It will be a challenge to manage and enforce this PSPO, but the evidence identifies hotspots where much of the petting of animals takes place, and despite warnings not to touch or feed the ponies, offenders persist in doing so. In such instances, a fine for persistent offenders should be enforced as a last resort to protect the welfare of both members of the public and the animals. [REDACTED] would recommend that both Cattle and Pigs are considered for inclusion in this PSPO as they also freely roam the Forest and could be subject to similar risks as the ponies.
Great idea but until people from outside the area are informed this will continue. You will have to have more staff enforcing this than animals on the forest making it completely uneconomical to have visitors to the forest
Hale Parish Council supports the introduction of PSPO2 and feels that it is necessary to protect the livestock in the New Forest.
Happy to ban feeding of ponies, as it is dangerous for them and increases aggression and encourages them on to the roads. I disagree that simply petting will increase aggression or encourage them on to roads. I'd prefer people didn't pet them but don't think you should use a PSPO to prevent it.
Have you/will you have adequate numbers of staff to enforce all these rules in reality?
Highly commendable aspiration but in practical terms however will this be policed consistently across the area? I suspect insufficient manpower resource will be facilitated which will lead to many infringements that are not penalised whilst others are. That's hardly fair.
[REDACTED] supports this proposal.
How are you going to police these policies ?
How is it going to be policed, regulated. There's loads of notices saying keep away from the animals but even if it's literally in front of them they ignore it. I am not a commoner but I have and will continue to try to stop people but even if the ban is imposed unless there's rigorous and ongoing enforcement over not just one or two years the ban will be totally ineffective. And I am supportive of the ban.
How is this going to be enforced? A paper exercise and complete waste of tax payers money.
How is this going to be enforced? Will Agisters have the mandate to issue PSPOs? Even if they did, there are too few of them to cover the no. of incidents especially over holiday periods.
How is this going to be policed. Unless there are numerous regular patrols around car parks etc it will come to nothing. People will not change their behaviour and visitors will not understand the impact of their actions. Have the large signs placed all over the area in the last 2 years had any impact? Probably not, so can this PSPO be effective? Probably not.
How will it be 'policed' ? You will need hundreds more Rangers with ability to fine people ?
How will this be policed? I assume there are already laws under cruelty to animals but they don't stop it. Without well publicised fines which are actually punitive and the people to give them out nothing will change. We need people with authority to have feet on the ground. The amount of litter in the forest is the biggest threat to animals but you keep reducing the number of bins...madness
How will you enforce it? The forest is a huge space and people are entitled idiots. Who will fund any enforcement that may be introduced?
How, and who by, will these orders be carried out? Will extra rangers be financed by NFDC?
I agree fully with the proposed ban on feeding. The ban on touching seems rather draconian, and very difficult to enforce.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

I agree in principle with the Council's desire to limit the feeding and petting of animals, but feel that as currently drafted it might seem too oppressive or be unenforceable, which is why I have not supported it as currently drafted. Particular concerns are that: 1. The proposals are very stark and on my reading would make it an offence to move animals off the roads - something that is necessary from time to time - both with stubborn animals that simply block the road for fun, and injured animals which need moving. I have also in the past led horses out of Godshill enclosure which they have entered because people have left the gate open and also freed a horse caught by its mane in a bramble bush. None of this should be prescribed. 2. Unlike the proposed PSPO prohibiting the lighting of fires, where all can understand the danger, people will be less receptive to this measure. They are gregarious and like animals. Donkeys and horses are curious and like company - especially if they think it can provide food. They will approach people who will respond and even if they don't feed them they will be affectionate because they like animals. Legislating against people's better instincts is fraught with difficulty and must be sensitively applied if it is to work. 3. Petting is not defined. If it is to remain part of the legislation it needs to be but it would be better to remove it - see below. 4. I would propose this part of the legislation is dropped and the measure is limited simply to prohibiting feeding of the animals. This is unambiguous and draws a distinct line that people can more readily understand and sympathise with. 5. Going further looks too much like banning fun, in a world where banning things is too often a weapon of first resort. 6. I do not really accept the assertion made in Q5 that if this measure is not adopted, horses etc may be removed from the areas affected. That would be an absurd overreaction, akin to punishing the victims of a crime. The trick is to get the legislation right, rather than implicitly threaten calamity if the order is not passed.

I agree that PSPO 2 needs to be introduced to provide further deterrent to interaction with, and petting of livestock in the proposed area. However, I feel it should be said that there has been an enormous increase in the number of animals on some of the commons, particularly donkeys and ponies. This seems to me to be deleterious to wildlife and provides more opportunities for interactions with the public. The scarcity of water and grass in last summer's drought put further pressure on the commons.

I agree wholeheartedly with the proposal as I know that bad habits can become ingrained in the animals being fed and this which will attract more animals to the various roads in the New Forest. Thus forming a danger to themselves caused by passing traffic, and a danger to the passing vehicles in so much that a crash could occur, injuring or killing either the animal or the occupant of the vehicle. Aggressive behaviour can also be developed and there have been reports in the local press of this behaviour becoming the reason that some animals have needed to be removed from the Forest. I feel that I would ask if those feeding and petting the animals would go into a field to feed or pet a horse in a field and if not, why not. Some years ago I was cycling through a wooded area in France and was surprised by the height of the grass and coarse weeds between the trees. I then realised the effect that the grazing animals had on the ecology and look of the landscape which would be irreversibly changed if the grazing animals were to be removed from the New Forest due to the unwanted attentions of humans feeding and petting them. All of the general public must realise that the animals in the Forest are essentially wild and have little interaction with humans.

I agree with both proposals. HOWEVER - at the moment, I suspect that 90% of visitors to the forest do not realise that they should not light a BBQ, nor should they feed the animals. As the forest is marketed as a PARK, many people will expect to be able to have a BBQ or feed the animals, which they assume will be tame. How will visitors know that they can't light a BBQ or feed the animals? Signage at the moment is far from adequate. Yes, there are plenty of signs, but who reads them? Signage needs to be vastly improved. All roads into the forest should have LARGE simple signs, preferably illuminated (like the motorway gantries) which tell people, in not many words, that BBQs and feeding the animals are banned. Boundaries: Why are the areas where these proposals apply different? Who, on earth, is going to know exactly where the boundaries are? Why not make the rules apply to the whole area within The New Forest designated area? Overall, this is a good initiative but it will stand or fall on how it is communicated and how it is policed.

I agree with the aims of the proposals, but NOT with the use of PSPO's which are very heavy handed and will criminalise day trippers and other tourists who often cannot be expected to know better. Educating these people via appropriate information channels should be the objective. It should be done in a way which is as non-intrusive as possible - no-one wants additional signage spoiling our beautiful forest. Perhaps Websites and social media offer a more discrete way to do this. This would be the thin end of the wedge? What next criminal restrictions on walking, dog walking, flying kites.....

I agree with the order but I think there must be discretion. People come here to see the ponies and don't understand the reasons for not petting or feeding them. Education and proper signage must surely come first. Those to be fined or prosecuted ought only to be those whom after being advised of the rules and why they are in place, continue to ignore them. My concern is that there won't be enough authorised officers to oversee this. I am also concerned about the attitude of quite a number of local people who think it is appropriate to shout at and harass anyone caught feeding or petting ponies (I've seen this happen many times) and that photos and videos shaming and ridiculing these people will be shared to social media. I've also seen many examples of this and it seems very unfair to people who often are just unaware of the implications behind their actions and think they are just being kind.

I agree with the proposal but am concerned as to how it will be policed and enforced.

I agree with the proposal but I think the £1000 fine is criminal especially in the current climate, there needs to be more signs about not feeding the animals

I agree with the proposal on a pspo on feeding animals in the forest. I do not agree with a pspo on petting. The idea of a child being fined for patting a donkey on the neck is not proportionate. I can't see how you could possibly enforce that element and the backlash on the local economy if tourists are being fined for a pat on the neck is greater than the harm being done. Psp on feeding, not petting

I agree with this proposal on the grounds of animal welfare. However, as I said with the BBQ and lighting fires proposal; how is this going to be enforced? I have [REDACTED] [REDACTED] around the Ibsley, Rockford Common areas and over three years have only seen representatives from the relevant authorities less than five times.

I also believe there is a serious lack of information/education and signage to warn of the risks to visitors. [REDACTED] and often stop to talk to people who are in these situations and most have no idea of the harm they are causing the animals or the risk of injury to themselves.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>I always thought it was against the bylaws to pet or feed livestock on the forest.</p>
<p>I am concerned it would not be practical or achievable to enforce these restrictions with the limited resources available.</p>
<p>I am fed up with seeing people especially at Lyndhurst and Beaulieu petting and feeding the animals when there are signs asking people not to do so. Not only is it dangerous but then if someone gets bitten or kicked then its the animal that gets the blame. Its about time that these people learnt that if they can't adhere to our rules then don't come to the Forest. Again as I stated in the BBQ one it needs to be policed at hot spots.</p>
<p>I am local to the forest and there several times a week, I have not encountered any problems with livestock. Feeding I absolutely agree should be prohibited. But I am not sure the odd tourist petting a Donkey is causing huge problems. I think this consultation should be separated, the feeding absolutely must not happen but the occasional petting I am not sure needs legislation.</p>
<p>I am puzzled by the fact that the 'New Forest Public Spaces Protection Order 2022' (Nos 1 &amp; 2) will be enacted by the New Forest District Council to cover areas which lie within the New Forest National Park. Why is it that the NFNPA are not solely dealing with this, without the involvement of NFDC? As the areas involved are all within the New Forest National Park, it is surely down to the NFNPA to administer, police and enforce the restrictions of lighting outdoor fires, and the feeding and petting of New Forest ponies, horses, donkeys, etc. The restrictions in the Orders are solely for the protection of the New Forest National Park Authority's landscape and animals so, understandably, it is not relevant for the areas of the NFDC which lies outside of the national park. I fully support the objectives of the Public Space Protection Orders, but the main omission is that the maps accompanying the Orders, exclude the areas of the NFNP that occur within Test Valley District Council, namely, Plaitford Common and Canada Common. This is because they fall outside of the NFDC area but they fall within the New Forest Perambulation boundary. So it would seem that the restrictions imposed by the Public Spaces Protection Orders will not apply or be enforceable in these TVDC areas. The reality of these restrictions is that the recently approved Green Hill Holiday Village on Landford Common can allow the daily 900 or so holidaymakers, who will be staying at the holiday lodges during spring/summer/autumn months, to use the direct access gate to Plaitford Common and beyond, where they will be able to light fires, have barbeques, feed and pet ponies, horses and donkeys, without any fear of fines or prosecution. This will also give them the mistaken assumption that these activities are permitted anywhere in the national park. Or will TVDC be creating their own Public Space Protection Orders to cover their areas which lie within the New Forest Perambulation boundary?</p>
<p>I am really pleased that this order is being proposed. I often pass families feeding and petting ponies with small children playing around the back of the pony. I have on occasions talked to offenders but have been totally ignored. I think offenders feel it is in their right to approach the ponies because they are there and free roaming in a national park. "National Parks are there for the people"</p>
<p>I am shocked that there is even the thought of removing New Forest ponies (are any big enough to be horses??), donkeys and mules from the forest. It is unthinkable and I for one would protest so strongly, it's making my blood boil thinking about it. Too much has happened negatively on the forest, this would be sacrilege. It would be better to remove and discourage people from visiting and using it like a leisure playground. We have got to this situation with less Police regularly patrolling and the same number of Verderers/Agisters for time immemorial, where the New Forest has been marketed and promoted as a place to come and "take" the scenery, air, benefits and now, as proved, also abuse our animals, which have been on the land for 100's of years. Removing the animals is not the answer. Enforcing age-old byelaws and ENSURING they are enforced, always, is definitely a positive step in the right direction.</p>
<p>I am surprised this is being recommended as I believed there was already bylaws in place prohibiting such things</p>
<p>I am wholly in support of the proposals</p>
<p>I am writing with Forestry England's response to your current consultation on two proposed PSPOs and to offer our support for their introduction. Forestry England has been working closely with New Forest District Council and our other partners across the New Forest to look at ways to enhance the care of this special place. The Recreation Management Strategy for the New Forest, supported by the steering group organisations, advisory group and the public through previous consultations, sets out a series of measures and objectives to ensure that this special place is both protected and provides access for all to enjoy the benefits of spending time here. We see the proposed PSPOs as an essential tool in supporting the work of this strategy. The free roaming animals that graze on the New Forest carry out an essential role in helping to look after and maintain this landscape and do so in a sustainable way. We support the proposed PSPO in this area as a measure to help support their role, enhance safety, and to highlight to those spending time in the New Forest the role they can play in supporting the area and visit responsibly. We are committed to working with New Forest District Council and other partner organisations in the New Forest to support the roll out of the PSPOs if they are enacted.</p>
<p>I believe feeding/petting ponies is already against the byelaws so I am not sure how effective this PSPO is likely to be... unless resources are allocated to enforcing it.</p>
<p>I believe fewer animals would be killed in the road if they weren't attracted to food being offered from vehicles.</p>
<p>I believe it is very important how we word this proposal as we do not want to discourage tourism which supports the local economy and enables the funding for the protection of our environment. Without discouraging visitors to the area we need to protect both the wildlife and people from themselves.</p>
<p>I believe most people who feed or touch the animals are simply ignorant of the potential effects of their actions. I think more signage would help, at every entrance to the Forest, with large boards in the main carparks. But I also believe that the only way to really get the message home is with the threat &amp; enforcement of penalties.</p>
<p>I believe one of these two proposals should also incorporate heavy fines for dropping litter, and should treat dog feaces as litter.</p>
<p>I believe the owners/commoners, verderers and agisters should do more to police this.</p>
<p>I can perfectly understand the desire to discourage people from feeding and petting animals. But they are mainly visitors who simply don't realise they are doing wrong, despite all the signs. So the threat of a £100 fine, and the occasional imposition of an actual fine, will simply make the national park look unfriendly. I don't think it will change behaviour.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>I could write a book on what i see whilst out on [REDACTED] across the Beaulie Heath. Mindless compromising of children's safety and that of the animals. Then, it is the animals that suffer when run over, horns removed on cows- don't get me started!!</p>
<p>I do agree with no feeding but [REDACTED] the forest [REDACTED] I feel that gentle petting of the ponies is fine and part of forest life.</p>
<p>I do not want Pigs being fed by the public either? I do strongly believe that there are far toomany Ponies and Cows in the New Forest now. I do feel that the numbers of Ponies and Cows should be restricted to lower numbers. Large areas of the Forest are getting more damaged by huge herds of Cows than by anything else.</p>
<p>I dont believe a mortal soul wishes to see any harm to the animals of the forest but yet again this mentality from forresters of wrapping their big arms around it and telling you "its ours... go away and dont come back". What next !!!.. check points and toll gates with the obvious officious idiot with peak cap and epaulettes on his shirt asking you what the hell do you think you are doing thinking you could come to the forest ?. Its ours. Please leave all your tourist revenue in the bucket then u turn your car. By all means ban the barbecue's and improve the parking but each new rule they impose on you is one step closer to closing the area off to the benefit of the privileged few. You are mereley forresters not Border Control and you would do well to remember that. Can you imagine the outrage in telling them don't dare past ashurst... Westquay and the city belongs to us. It belongs to everybody !!!!!!!!</p>
<p>I don't consider that the petting/feeding problem is so problematic as to require withdrawal of the livestock from the Forest if the Order is not made. Doing that would have a very dramatic effect on the Forest's unique ecology and should not be considered lightly: the overall ecology is much more important than the relatively limited risk of occasional accident that feeding/petting may (evidence unclear) increase. I note that the animal road casualty rate in the Forest is currently very low, although it fluctuates. Separately, there does not seem to be any particular reason why the order should not also apply to pigs during pannage but presently they are not covered - perhaps there is a separate order?</p>
<p>I fail to see how this can possibly be enforced given the size of the restricted area, therefore rendering any attempt to introduce it doomed to failure.</p>
<p>I found question 5 difficult to answer, as I think that the withdrawal of Donkeys, Ponies etc. would be to the detriment of the environment, the animals and the Commoners "â€" and wasn't sure which box to highlight to express this view.</p>
<p>I fully support the proposal</p>
<p>I fully support the PSPO. It would be good if this could be extended to include any kind of intentional/reckless disturbance of the livestock - for instance this year I witnessed people driving ponies towards the road at Bolton's Bench using a drone. Similarly it would be helpful if it included dog disturbance</p>
<p>I have concerns about this approach, as could stop enjoyment of the forest to all. Will picnic areas be introduced, which are fenced off from animals to let all enjoy the forest. Imposition of fines could be abused and lead to intimidation and discourage people visiting the area. Feel better education and more visible presence of authorised forestry personnel way forward.</p>
<p>I have had confrontations with tourists in previous years in which I asked them not to approach, pet or feed the ponies in the forest (proposed restricted area). I told them not only was it unsafe for them but they were putting the ponies in danger because the creatures would then be more likely to approach passing cars, looking for handouts and possibly getting hit... The tourists refused to stop. They argued that these are not wild animals, they're already used to people and that they (the visitors) had the right to interact with them as part of their holiday experience. I could not claim to be the owner (they asked me if I was),therefore I had no power to make them stop. As necessary as this protection order is, it may well prove difficult to enforce when most of those violating it will be strangers, tourists, passers by. How would a witness get an ID for them or prove the violation? Who will be responsible for advising visitors, since this problem has gone on for years in spite of it being mentioned in tourist guides and leaflets?</p>
<p>I have [REDACTED] in the Forest [REDACTED] and it is upsetting to see how the way animals are treated by the visitors has changed over the years. Nothing has been done previously to prevent this until it is too late.</p>
<p>I have seen what happens to these beautiful animals after an incident; horrible.</p>
<p>I have visited and worked in and on behalf of Forest groups [REDACTED]. Any thought of removing animals from the Forest is insanity!</p>
<p>I have witnessed cars parked up on the side of the road and the occupants feeding and petting livestock. This is doubly dangerous as it causes a hazard for vehicles and bicycles and encourages livestock onto roads. Therefore I agree with the proposals.</p>
<p>I have witnessed poor regard and respect paid to the equine and bovine stock in the New Forest. To me it is clear that there are many visitors that are ignorant of, or choose to ignore , the consequence of their actions approaching, feeding, petting and in many cases littering or otherwise contaminating the environment that these magnificent creatures consider their home.</p>
<p>I have witnessed so many visitors to the area feeding and petting wild animals in the forest and a young child being kicked by a new forest pony ! They are not zoo animals , they are beautiful wild creatures that roam the New Forest and should be left to be viewed from a suitable safe distance !!</p>
<p>[REDACTED] and have always been upset to see visitors who get too near the ponies and donkeys to get a photo or to pet them. A few years ago, I witnesses someone placing their very young child on one of the ponies to get a photo. I feel the bold yellow warning signs that have been placed around Bolton's Bench are excellent and, hopefully, will help to keep visitors away from the livestock. However, a penalty fine will be an even better incentive, so I'm totally in favour of this proposal.</p>
<p>I hope PSPO No 2 comes into force and I hope it can be enforced by the officials designated to the task ie keepers, rangers.</p>
<p>I hope the powers are available to non government organisations as well. Having read information from where such powers already exist they are hardly used at all. The threat of a fine is usually enough to defuse the situation. If only NPA, FE and NFDC employees have the powers it will lead to alot of other people who currently assist with the problem being increasingly ignored</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>I know a lot of people will say that we ought to educate rather than take punitive measures. However, [REDACTED] I didn't understand until about 2 years after moving, why I shouldn't put out water or scraps for them. Visitors to the forest don't stay for 2 years or more, and therefore there needs to be a mechanism in order for residents to discourage visitors from endangering behaviour.</p>
<p>[REDACTED] and although not personally impacted am very aware of the dangers of animals gathering by the roadside especially near car parks, driving is often hazardous for the animals and any disincentive to feed/ encourage them can only be beneficial to animals and the forest.</p>
<p>I live outside of the proposed restricted areas [REDACTED] and have experienced problems with members of the public feeding and petting them.</p>
<p>I note this does not apply to other animals such as the pannage pigs? Should they also be included? Otherwise support the implementation of the pspo thanks</p>
<p>I once came across a dead pony which was later reported as dying of colic through ingesting food that it should not have had access to. As well as being a tragic loss of a pony and commoners loss, a dead pony is also a health threat to people and other animals.</p>
<p>I question how the order will be policed/ enforced.</p>
<p>I really hope that this measure is introduced (but please don't put warnings on reflective signs near the road as it makes the livestock even harder to spot at night!)</p>
<p>[REDACTED] Canada and they have a clear country policy no feeding or interference with any bird or animal with a straight \$1000 fine for breaching this. You do not get harassed by birds as they do not expect food. I have tried to picnic in the New Forest and the ponies are a nuisance as people who have fed them have misled them that all are willing to feed them. The council needs to be really strict with this issue and up the fines</p>
<p>I regularly see visitors feeding and petting the ponies, donkeys and pigs and they don't know what they are doing and cannot read the animals body language and follow them when the animals are trying to get away. If they are not stopped someone probably a child is going to get seriously hurt!!!! If you tell them not to do it, you just get verbally abused!</p>
<p>I strongly applaud the NFDC for grasping the nettle. This needs to be done to protect the Forest and for the wellbeing of the animals.</p>
<p>I strongly endorse the introduction of the proposed PSPO.</p>
<p>I strongly support the introduction of this order</p>
<p>I support this proposal 100% &amp; it is long overdue. Thank you so much for this proposal to protect the New Forest animals . The forest &amp; its animals is a very special place &amp; we have a duty to protect it for future generations. Thank you</p>
<p>I think for public safety more education needs to be put in place. When I pulled a dog poop bag from my pocket recently to clear up after my dogs a pony not far away pricked it's ears up and started approaching me at speed - putting me and my dogs in a very dangerous situation and making it very clear the pony has learnt to associate the bag with food. Luckily I'm very experienced with horses and confident enough to look stern enough to shoo the pony off - someone else could have been terrified and in serious danger. We need a lot of firm, polite public education and warnings .... I welcome this PSPO with open arms, a long time coming and we really need it...</p>
<p>I think it is vital if we are to preserve the special nature of the forest and the uniqueness to the ecology brought about by commoning animals.</p>
<p>I think it should include not disturbing them at all either - I've had to tell people not to chase the ponies. It should include other animals too - the cattle and pigs.</p>
<p>I think it will be very difficult to police. And therefore a local waste of money.</p>
<p>I think it would be prohibitively difficult to enforce this. Also, conflating "petting" and feeding are two very different issues, with different difficulties and issues. Feeding should probably be prioritised as trying to police and prevent. How exactly would you propose to catch and sanction someone stroking an animal? It seems fraught with problems and the two issues should be addressed as separate things.</p>
<p>I think it's a mistake to group feeding and petting into one category. A £100 fine for petting a pony is a sledgehammer to crack a nut. The area relies on tourism. Secondly, there's one question in this questionnaire which is awful. It reads (essentially) 'If you don't support this, we might take away all the new forest ponies. Is that good?' This isn't a referendum on whether to remove all ponies from common land. To link them is like saying "We're proposing to change the motorway speed limit to 75mph. If it doesn't happen, all motorways might be removed. How would you like that?' It's a silly question.</p>
<p>I think Map 2 is easier to remember and understand for everyone. Map 1 is confusing in my opinion. I don't think animals should be withdrawn from the forest...they are part of the forest... if it's decided you are a forest...it goes back to my original point make up your mind are you a forest? It's all part of the ecosystem in my opinion. If it is decided to enforce a penalty system - how is it going to be "policed" . The penalty of £100 isn't a penalty for some people that are in this area also the magistrate courts are already overrun nationally and getting the evidence together for it to stand up in court for £100 is silly so is this a realistic solution? Maybe the fine should be £500 or £1000 ? Or why can't the penalty be clearing out horse poo from the village roads?</p>
<p>I think on the whole people are careful around the ponies. Notices in car parks advising people not to feed them and giving reasons regarding protection on both sides are definitely welcomed and could be TRIED FIRST. BUT THE BEST PROTECTION for horses and walkers and cyclists is to LOWER THE SPEED LIMIT TO MAX 25 mph on all but the 'through roads' - which should also be reduced to MAX 50 mph due to deer.</p>
<p>People will be worried about coming to The New Forest and that shouldn't be the idea.</p>
<p>I think the PSPO should also cover cows, pigs and sheep.</p>



Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>I think the wording should change from New Forest ponies - a definition of a New Forest pony is not all ponies/horses on the forest. Could it be reworded to say all lawfully depastured livestock-this would include cows and pigs</p>
<p>I think this is such a good idea as well as some more public awareness schemes! This will help save our animals and forest.</p>
<p>I think you are quite wrongly conflating the feeding and petting of animals. They are different things. I agree there should be a ban on feeding animals but are you really going to fine someone £100 for patting a horse on the nose? Often the animals approach people. They can be friendly and curious. While the animals should be respected, I get a strong feeling that there are some people who just want to ban everything in the forest. I remind you it is common land. It was not part of the enclosure acts. Perhaps you should think about what that means.</p>
<p>I think your question about public safety is missing the point here. I believe that the issue is more about safety of the animals in attracting them to spaces near roads and car parks and feeding them inappropriate food.</p>
<p>I totally agree with this proposal for the New Forest, Crown Land. However, I also feel this approach should be applied to Barton Common which I understand are managed by New Milton District Council and the Hampshire Heathlands Project. I would also like to draw your attention to the need for a couple of dog waste bins actually put in the Common rather than at just the beginning as I have noted that some dog owners actually place the dogs waste in little black bags then dump it on the ground or even worse tie it to branches on bushes. This is a danger to ponies.</p>
<p>I very much hope this becomes reality</p>
<p>I walk with my children in the forest and it concerns me that ponies will approach us expecting to be fed. I grew up around equines and I know food can cause the most friendly to become hostile.</p>
<p>I was under the impression that you were not allowed to feed the animals anyway. Policing this will be very difficult</p>
<p>I wonder how many new enforcement officers there will be to ensure this would be enforced: there are not enough FE or National Park Rangers and they do not have enforcement powers</p>
<p>I wonder why other commoners stock are not included (pigs, cattle &amp; sheep), I appreciate these are less often fed or petted, but I have witnessed people attempting to pet cattle (Highlands) and feed pigs with apples, so not unknown.</p>
<p>I would agree to not allowing the feeding of the ponies etc. but I do not agree to stopping people petting or touching the animals. Young children, visitors and tourists love the fact they can stand next to a pony and have their photo taken, they may gently stroke their heads and I see no harm in this. To stop all contact between humans and the wild animals, would make the animals much more fearful of humans and would be more harmful to the old traditional ways of the New Forest. It is a public place for the public to enjoy - sensibly, yes, but not over controlled by over zealous rules and regulations.</p>
<p>I would include all animals grazed on the Forest including cattle and pigs. I have seen people petting these animals.</p>
<p>I would like to think that the Forest and the animals are protected for the future. To think of the forest without these animals would be devastating.</p>
<p>I would rather increase public education on the issues of petting and feeding animals on the Forest - i don't want to be in a police state where it's a crime - i don't agree with PSPOs</p>
<p>I would rather you separated the feeding and petting in the prior questions. I am not as concerned by petting as by feeding. I don't want the animals acclimatised to humans, but a criminal penalty seems harsh for petting.</p>
<p>I would strongly support this PSPO should also like there to be one controlling dogs and their interaction with ponies, donkeys and cattle (as well as people).</p>
<p>I would suggest that the PSPO be extended to include all livestock (e.g. cattle and pigs) to give the message greater clarity. Introducing a rule for some animals but not others is harder for people to understand and harder to enforce.</p>
<p>I write on behalf of [REDACTED] which has a members of over hundred. We agree with Proposal 2 which includes Beaulieu and its surrounding area</p>
<p>I'd like to see it include pigs. During pannage I've seen pigs literally being chased into a road by people trying to get close up photos.</p>
<p>[REDACTED] mainly pick up litter . Perhaps another category of ambassador or Community protector/helper (maybe have another coloured hi-viz ?) ? That can help and educate in busy areas - best to do this in groups of 2 or 3 not on your own. Through email - set up these small groups</p>
<p>I'm in full support.</p>
<p>I'd go a step further and prohibit the stopping of motor vehicles, decamping from said vehicle to get a 'closer look' at the ponies. Fine these people and highlight this in adverts, this hopefully will stop other stupid people, and help the animals too.</p>
<p>If animals were not fed by people at the roadside or by hand, the animals would not have a reason to gravitate to people in the hope of being fed. This should help to stop animals becoming friendly towards strangers and looking for food.</p>
<p>If introduced hope there is power to enforce.</p>
<p>If only this could actually be monitored and enforced but I don't believe even if this goes ahead anything will change as there isn't enough forestry commission staff actually out enforcing these rules</p>
<p>If something is not done more commoners will stop commoning to the detriment of the forrest</p>
<p>If the animals are to remain (as I hope will be the case) I do feel they should all (ponies, cows and donkeys) have a reflective collar so that they are more easily seen in the dark by motorists.</p>
<p>If we don't take these measures the animals are at risk of being domesticated in the eyes of visitors . They are wild animals albeit gentle but still wild. It will inevitably lead to an increase in animal deaths and the possibility of zoonosis.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>If we want to protect the forest, we need to make sure people leave the grazing animals alone!</p>
<p>In my opinion it is the feeding which causes the problems. Petting has only a limited effect because the animals will always be tolerant to humans.</p>
<p>In regards to the previous question relating to the withdrawal of livestock from the Forest if the PSPO is not instigated - this is a somewhat ludicrous suggestion. Who are you suggesting withdraws the livestock? It is a right for commoners to depasture animals, and grazing animals are part of what keeps the habitat so special. There doesn't appear to have been a huge withdrawal of animals in recent years so it seems unlikely, given continuing financial advantages, that livestock would voluntarily be withdrawn on a large scale. Are you suggesting that there will be an obligatory withdrawal? This seems unfeasible from a legal stance. Additionally, there would be benefit to having less numbers of livestock on the Forest to allow the habitat to actually have some natural regeneration, instead of being constantly overgrazed, but the loss of all livestock would irrevocably change the habitat and therefore unlikely to be seen favourably by Natural England. The question did not provide an opportunity to provide further details. With these points in mind I feel the question was a poor survey item.</p>
<p>In some areas the PSPO cannot be supported as the land is Private. therefore there is not a blanket ban, I am not sure how this can be made clear to tourists.</p>
<p>Include no touching of cows and pigs. A blanket ban on touching any animals roaming on the forest, unless you are the owner. It would make the rule very clear, ( unless it is deemed an emergency situation).</p>
<p>Is fly tipping garden waste included?</p>
<p>Is it worth considering expecting places where holidaymakers stay e.g. hotels, guest houses, holiday rentals, campsites to display signs and provide copies of 'The New Forest Code' to every newcomer.</p>
<p>Is there any way of confining the animals to actual forest land instead of allowing them to roam along high streets - eg Brockenhurst for example? Perhaps they would be less likely to be petted if they were away from residential/commercial areas? There is no mention here of pigs, which are put out during the pannage season - although probably less likely to be petted - the pigs have been known to destroy rubbish bags that have been put out for waste collection day.</p>
<p>It is a brilliant proposal and highly necessary to ensure not only the safety of the animals but also the safety of humans, who put themselves in danger by petting these wild animals (not only is there a risk of being bitten or kicked, but also of being bitten by ticks and contracting Lyme disease), which I don't think people appreciate. It seems they think the animals are semi tame and can be treated as such, when they are not. A prohibition being introduced would help to educate people.</p>
<p>It is a mistake to limit this PSPO to the restricted area and not cover the Commons and all the area perceived by the public as 'The New Forest'. It is giving mixed messages to the MOPs - you cannot feed/pet the animals in one area but you can in another. Unfortunately, unless there are specific signs prohibiting an action, the majority of the public consider that they may do it.</p>
<p>It is a shame that this cannot be a matter of common sense but I agree it is the best way forward.</p>
<p>It is essential that commoning continues in the National Park as part of continuing the activities that have produced this unique area over centuries. It is also important that visitors enjoy a safe environment and know that their activities contribute towards how the area might change in the future. To continue to enjoy this wonderful area we need its special legal protections to be upheld.</p>
<p>It is essential that suitable signage be provided to alert the public to the prohibition of feeding or petting. Many years ago we did have such signs around the forest.</p>
<p>It is imperative this goes through, the public are not listening or reading signs - Law is the only way .</p>
<p>It is necessary for the safety of animals on the forest as people are often seen feeding them on the roadside also it can kill the ponies</p>
<p>It is not clear whether the proposed PSPO is only intended to deal with hand feeding of depastured animals. It should include putting down food such as apples and other discarded foodstuffs for animals to eat, since from a health point of view this has the potential for serious harm to animals. The order should also include cattle which, although not likely to be hand fed, will readily eat large amounts of discarded food.</p>
<p>It is tourists that tend to feed and pet the animals. In order for this to work notices must be put in all the car parks otherwise people will be unaware of this offence. A warning must be given for the first offence and a fine for any further offences. I do not think this should be a criminal offence as that has serious consequences for a person which is out of proportion to the possible offences.</p>
<p>It is vital this PSPO is passed as it may help with animal accidents</p>
<p>It needs to be implemented but how can it be policed? We as the locals can only advise, explain and hand out relevant leaflets.</p>
<p>It needs to include all livestock ie: cattle pigs ponies donkeys and shetlands.</p>
<p>It needs to include ALL livestock that is owned by Commoners ie Pigs Cows Shetlands Donkeys NF ponies</p>
<p>It should be implemented as soon as possible and the fines enforced</p>
<p>It should include all animals owned by the Commoners that graze the forest: ponies, mules, cattle, sheep and pigs</p>
<p>It should include cattle and pigs as well .</p>
<p>It would be a disaster of historic proportions if animals were to be moved off the forest because of those who cannot read clear and simple signs or who do not think the signs refer to them. Enforcement is not mentioned. Without effective enforcement this PSPO would be a complete waste of time.</p>
<p>It would be an ecological and financial disaster if livestock were to be removed from the Forest! People have been asked nicely not to feed the ponies but this has little effect.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>It would be heartbreaking if the ponies &amp; donkeys were removed from the area due to the irresponsibility of a minority of people. I have personally had to inform many visitors about the dangers of petting &amp; feeding the ponies/donkeys but am frequently met with anger or derision. Like with the BBQ's / Fires, there has to be clear signage and also a presence to deter visitors from doing what they want with regards to petting &amp; feeding</p>
<p>It would be tragic if ponies etc were taken out of this restricted area as their presence is wonderful. To have free roaming animals is special. This action would significantly alter the biodiversity of the area and so change the landscape forever. Who would maintain this then? I hope that visitors are better informed; -understanding the implications of their actions and so stopping them from feeding the animal. A better marketing campaign is needed using all forms of promotion. Obviously more money is needed. Current marketing has not worked.</p>
<p>It would need proper enforcement</p>
<p>It would need to be enforced with some prosecutions to show action will be taken otherwise many will ignore it as people regularly do with cycling where they are not allowed to; there should be stricter enforcement of all forest laws and byelaws and greater emphasis on ensuring adherence to the country code inc cycling through more notices and education for both residents and through tourist establishments.</p>
<p>It's a good idea in theory, but how will it be carried out? These incidents are all over so how would it be "policed" so to speak, issuing fines is all very well but first you have to catch the perpetrator in the act.</p>
<p>It's not just the danger to the public that feeding the livestock causes. There's no mention in this proposal of the fact that: 1. it encourages the ponies towards cars and onto the roads, where they are more likely to be hit by a car, 2. the feed itself might cause choke or other illness, or 3. that persistently feeding or watering the livestock interferes with their natural foraging, &amp; might mean that the bottom members of the herd don't get feed &amp; water at all. I think these are also worth a mention. I'm fully supportive of this proposal.</p>
<p>It's necessary.</p>
<p>I've noted just one example in a previous section of this questionnaire. That is only one example, albeit probably the worst one, of many instances I've seen of ponies in particular interacting with people and cars on verges or in car parks over the years. Some of these people are just so stupid.</p>
<p>Just hope you can reduce the mindless behaviour of some of the visitors, so we can all enjoy the New Forest we love in safety!</p>
<p>Life is too short to not stroke the ponies</p>
<p>Losing grazing animals from the New Forest SSSI/SAC poses an existential threat to the New Forest's internationally significant habitats. At present, the risk of interactions between members of the public and livestock is one of the biggest contributing factors to this threat, and therefore any legislative action that can be put in place to help lessen this risk should be viewed as highly positive.</p>
<p>Many years ago before the current 40mph speed limit was introduced along with reflective pony collars [REDACTED] Sadly she had to be put down by the agister and her young became orphans. Since the 1970s lots of practical work has been done around road safety and these latest measures will contribute positively to the balance between livestock and road users</p>
<p>More education to tourists. They are not aware of any of the dangers, either on PSPO 1 or 2. Signage does not work, people choose to either ignore or just don't notice it. (mostly ignore). Maybe a large electronic sign on M27/A31 flashing up quick messages as to what is prohibited? You will never get rid of both these problems but hopefully if these orders are in place then maybe there will be revenue that could be put back into the New Forest? Shame you cannot put another order together regarding dog waste. I am a litter picker and the forest is just covered in it. This is also a risk to life if ingested. Again, mostly locals do this, they think it is fine that their dog messes everywhere. They think it is biodegradable and nature to the environment. It is not.. as dogs eat meat. You wouldn't put dog poo on your roses would you!!</p>
<p>More funding for enforcement.</p>
<p>More ranger, etc., presence on the Forest floor</p>
<p>More rules more rules more rules more rules and worst of all... YOU NEVER LISTEN TO ANYTHING YOU DONT WANT TO HEAR. Quite obviously the residents of the forest are going to be the majority of opinions and therefore the outcome is inevitable and will tell you exactly what you want to hear without you spending money on this</p>
<p>My concern is, how would this be acted on/how would this be policed?</p>
<p>[REDACTED] I love the forest. People don't understand that hand feeding ponies, even ones in fields, leads them to be badly behaved and competitive and demanding for food. This makes them pushy and dangerous.</p>
<p>My only comment is that I hope that knowing this new law is in place will be enough of a deterrent - otherwise I wonder how it will be enforced!</p>
<p>My only concern is that innocent people who have not seen the signs and do not understand about the dangers of petting ponies etc might end up with a criminal record. But I presume it would have to be persistent offending after being warned that would lead to this?</p>
<p>No one will admit they have been feeding livestock, even when you witness it. For the sake of my animals welfare, we need it to stop.</p>
<p>None. Ban it outright. That way the guilty individuals can pay the fine.</p>
<p>Not sure feeding or petting on private property should be exempt. For example, if an animal is standing next to someone's garden and people pet or feed the animal from their garden, over their garden fence/wall, that should also be prohibited.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

Often see people petting ponies, food oven left on verges. How will this be policed, never see a ranger.
Orders should not be for 3 years, 6 months or a year is plenty and each time reviewed before reapplication.
Part of the attraction of The New Forest to visitors is seeing (many for the first time) animals roaming free. I can understand why some would like to be photographed by a horse or donkey, and pet one. The dangers are the unpredictable nature of the animals, even though they do become used the attention. And that is the second cause for concern - encouraging the animals to frequent road-sides. I think feeding to be the greater risk to animal safety and preventing this more important than petting if done away from the road. As with PSPO No 1, I wonder how this can be enforced, given the number of visitors compared to the number of Rangers etc. Education has to be key to this.
People are irresponsible, so if they won't take notice of not feeding the animals, then we have then that responsibility should taken away from the public. These are owned animals and wild, New Forest is not a zoo....
People do not understand it is really bad to feed livestock. The signs seem to have no impact if they get a chance of a "good" photo. People are so starved of contact with animals they mistake curiosity for friendliness and this can be bad for both parties.
People from outside the area do not realise the dangers of feeding and petting the animals. They are not domestic animals or pets but live in the wild. By feeding them and petting them they encourage the animals to approach humans looking for food and run the risk that these animals may become more aggressive towards humans in that search.
People have been told not to approach the ponies but they don't listen, some become abusive when told they should no do it. Making it an offence is a good idea.
People just don't realise that the ponies are feral and they could easily be mobbed, bitten or kicked. They don't realise carrots etc will cause the ponies to have colic etc. And that attracting ponies to the roadside increases the chance of road accidents.
People like animals. They like to stroke and feed them. Generally, people do not understand the problems that this causes. If it is made illegal the people concerned are unlikely to even know this and so it will make no difference to their behaviour - people that know it is illegal will probably already know that its not a good idea. Consequently, I do not see that this order would help solve the problem. I believe that the answer lies in EDUCATION.
People should abide by the by laws, but obviously they can't. Introducing PSPO no 2 is the best course of action, as this would still allow animals on the forest and allow us to admire and respect them. I have lived in the New Forest all my life and love seeing all the animals, I feel privileged to live here, unfortunately some visitors do not respect them, therefore making it law not to feed or pet them is essential.
People should be employed to hand out fines to people feeding or petting ponies. I know i personally would do the job as I know many people who would you wouldn't even need to pay them. Start handing out fines and the word getting around then it should decrease and put people off doing as who wants to come on holiday and pay a £100 fine.
Perhaps it would be possible to extend this order to littering, including the leaving of dog poo bags. It is clear to me that enforcement powers are necessary, since even if only a minority of visitors are irresponsible their behaviour is a very real problem.
Perhaps the tourists should have set petting feeding times organised by the new forest or the animal owners? At restricted areas in forest.
Perhaps this PSPO order could be accompanied by more awareness-raising of the issues e.g. a feature on prgrammes like Countryfile? An education programme in schools, school assemblies? Information prominently displayed in New Forest Guesthouses and hotels?
Perhaps pugs should also be included.
Permanent and securely fixed notices need to be erected to inform the public of the importance of not feeding livestock
Please add Hale and Hatchet Green to map 2! In fuller answer to Q. 5 if you have no animals freely grazing you will lose the environmental value of this unique habitat and end up with a Disneyland type scrubland. Commoners and their animals should be valued more highly and the struggle to maintain this historical and cultural gem should be respected and supported far more than is currently being done.
Please also include the National Trust Commons and also adjoining commons such as Minstead Manor which appear to be excluded. They all form part of the perambulation of the New Forest.
Please bring this in as soon as possible, and bring back the signs that were often placed near the cattle grids coming in to the Forest warning of fines for feeding wild animals
Please introduce this PSPO to help protect the ponies etc whose home it is. If the people who think the New Forest is a petting zoo are allowed to continue their irresponsible behaviour resulting in the stock being removed it would be devastating and most certainly irreversible. The stock should be protected at all costs to ensure the future of the forest.
Please please implement this as I personally feel it is highly likely that a child will be seriously injured soon. People simply don't understand these animals are owned and can actually hurt individuals. They need to keep their distance and learn to just take photos as a memento.
Please, please stop the feeding or touching of livestock. They are there for a reason and I want my grandkids to learn about pony's pigs and cows ,not in books but by seeing them roam the forest, the same way I did as a child
Policing and who is going to pay for it? The local council tax payers I suppose!
Policing it and enforcing it would be a problem
Policing will be a challenge.
Proper enforcement and procecutions would prevent numerous personal injuries especially to visitors who unwittingly get pestered and attacked by ponies previously fed by others

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

PSPO No.2 (and No.1) will be a waste of time unless we have an enforcement agency with sufficient powers and in sufficient numbers to enforce them. We also now know that dog fouling can also have a serious effect on the health of New Forest animals.
Question number 5 is worded in a strange way to suggest the ponies could be removed from the PSPO area. This could be misleading to people, the ponies being removed isn't part of the debate here. This is about how we manage people's behaviour to respect and protect the new forest. This tool is one of many that is needed to help those people that work in the relevant authorities to manage the new forest.
Quite frankly, I'm not one of those "Freemen of the land" or such other conspiratorial nonsense, but this is draconian. We want to encourage tourists and people to the New Forest, not give them £100 fines for minor infractions. Educate, don't indoctrinate.
Remove non native ponies from the restricted area. It's ridiculous to have some commoners bringing in coloured ponies from outside the new forest . They are not fed they bully the local native ponies and have chased dogs being quietly walked. By the existing new forest rules only NF ponies can be turned out.
See comments above. £100 might be too low a penalty in some cases. I think there should be a sliding scale. I'm not confident that criminal proceedings would be taken against persistent offenders so the on the spot fines should be higher for such offenders. Also, I think the fines should apply to the owners of the holiday lets where they have not provided sufficient information to the offending tenants.
Should be done with education first. In any case no one will enforce the pspo. It's an empty threat. I would not expect police to deal with this trivial matter when they have more important things to deal with.
Should cattle and pigs not be added to the regulation?
Should have been introduced long ago to prevent animals being exposed to this dangerous behaviour.
Similar to my comments about the proposal regarding lighting of fires/bbq's - will there be sufficient resources to patrol and enforce the rules. It is essential that people keep their distance from New Forest animals.
Simply touching a pony could attract a £1,000 fine?? Madness! No feeding the animals is very important but separate the two problems.
Some animals can choke or become unwell eating items given to them, as not everyone is aware of specific diets natural to that animal. Food can also cause fights to which animals are being hurt, but also people may get stuck in the middle of.
Some of the ponies that are most savvy to visiting people feeding them have the most forest knowledge. To lose the knowledge of the environment that these ponies have would be detrimental to the younger ponies and stops it being passed on. These older ponies can find water in a drought, know where the best shelter is, know the rhythm of the forest and have a lot to offer but are also the most able to extract food from the unwise
Some real effort to stop people thinking the Forest is a petting zoo is way overdue. Do we have to wait until someone is killed before something is done? Unfortunately all the efforts to educate the public have failed. Anyone, be they an ordinary member of the public or an officer from one of the Statutory Bodies, who tries to intervene is usually told to 'go away' (putting it politely) by the person they are trying to educate. Animals which injure a person are ordered off the Forest and usually shot as they are semi-feral and do not thrive in 'captivity'. That is a shame and it isn't fair. Commoners, who own the animals, are also being sued by people who have been injured. That is putting commoning at risk. If the public did not feed the animals, these problems would be pretty much completely avoided.
Stop leaving animals unsupervised
Strong emphasis in the consultation about the safety of humans, but equally important is the welfare of animals. I fully support this proposal - actually I think it's long overdue - but I do wonder how the order is going to be policed in such a large area?
Strongly endorse this proposal. Have observed undesirable visitor behaviour on many occasions. Publicity campaigns are insufficient. Even some locals are stupid enough to leave stuff on forest land (e.g. leftover pumpkins after halloween) This is regularly discussed on local social media groups.
Test Valley Borough Council should be encouraged to adopt a similar PSPOs covering its part of the New Forest near Wellow.
Thank you. This is a welcome step forward.
That the order should be more focused on the feeding, as petting was not seen as an issue by councillors.
The animals are vital for the natural ecology of the area. People seem to be unaware that they are wild animals and not pets.
The animals are vital to the forest and their welfare and freedom within the forest boundary should be paramount and exceed any impact on tourism.
The animals should be allowed to continue to roam where they have done for many years - any change would have a severe impact on the New Forest, the flora and fauna, biodiversity etc Humans are the issue not the animals and everything should be done to allow the animals to stay where they belong.
The animals were there first and should definitely not be removed. There needs to be more visible presence and on the spot fines. Perhaps use volunteer rangers
The Commoners should be safe in the knowledge that their stock is being given more protection.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>The donkeys &amp; ponies are an integral part of the identity of the forest. Visitors need to remember that the forest &amp; all of its' amazing wildlife were here first &amp; should be respected. On a related subject: personally more needs to be done to protect the forest particularly in terms of car drivers/speeding etc. I am regularly overtaken when driving through the forest even when I'm almost at 40mph. I know that speeding/careless driving causes numerous animal deaths &amp; I would support any measures/proposals to address this.</p>
<p>The feral ponies, donkeys, mules and cows shape the new forest and make it the beautiful, unique place it is now. To take these away would be to turn the new forest into an overgrown scrub land.</p>
<p>The forest wildlife should come above tourism which benefits only a few business and is a nuisance to homeowners</p>
<p>The impact on the forest if these animals are all removed is unknown. It will have an impact, both positive and negative. "overgrazing" will be reduced however the special species (i.e. fungi in NF pony poo will no longer be rife in the area) and special qualities of some areas (poaching of the ground by each type of animal is different and benefits different species) would be negative. Official, designated staff would need to be in place to sort fines. Commoners would need to be supported to have positive conversations still. Educational sessions for campsites, new people moving into the area, local schools, groups and communities (both inside the restricted area and up to an hours drive away) as well as businesses etc too.</p>
<p>The introduction and enforcement of this PSPO is absolutely vital for the future of the New Forest as we know it.</p>
<p>The issue isn't the PSPO, but the resources to manage and enforce it - and given this is a mainly visitor related issue I believe, how it will be communicated. [REDACTED] which promotes responsible behaviour - in our case dog owners - but feeding the animals isn't responsible and should be stopped.</p>
<p>The livestock in the Forest is an integral part of the culture, history, economy and ecology of the area. We should do everything in our power to protect livestock.</p>
<p>The maximum fine of £100 should be a minimum. I can foresee problems in enforcing the PSPO without police in attendance. The message could be more clearly communicated to members of the public if each animal wore a reflective collar stating "Please do not touch or feed me".</p>
<p>The nature of the forest environment is the direct result of the grazing of commoners' animals. If this grazing ceased the character of the forest would inevitably change.</p>
<p>The New Forest needs far more educational signage in main areas. This would surely be far cheaper than policing the PSPO No 2 order.</p>
<p>The order should be amended to include all commoners livestock, including pigs, cattle and sheep. Inappropriate interaction with the public is just as potentially dangerous to both the animals and the public. It should be noted, as asked in your PSPO No 1 consultation to prevent wildfires, that the ecology of the New Forest would be severely affected by the loss of the grazing and trampling patterns of the variety of commoners livestock (a key element creating the many niches for our rarest species), as well as the danger to some livestock should the practice of panage pigs cease.</p>
<p>The order should refer to all legally depastured stock on the Forest. It should refer to all ponies on the Forest, not just New Forest ponies - there is a potential loophole that someone might say that a shetland-type pony or a coloured pony is not covered because they are not New Forest ponies, so therefore they can continue to be petted and fed.</p>
<p>The petting and feeding of livestock should be prohibited in all of the New Forest.</p>
<p>The ponies and donkeys and other animals are part of the forest and it's special quality. You can't take these away. People need to be taught that they are the problem.</p>
<p>The problem you outline is not restricted to visitors or tourists it is also members of our local communities, who you may argue "should know better"! However, I feel that the proposed restrictions are reasonable and may help to either prevent or reduce the detrimental effect of the behaviour, but should be a last resort. I do feel that the enforcement of the PSBO and issuing FPN has the potential to lead to conflict situations with the risk of injury and an incident spiralling out of control. Enforcement is not easy. From your material I note that "Authorised Officer" means a constable or person authorised in writing by the Council for the purposes of this Order. The Police are primarily responsible for preventing crime and keeping the peace or keeping the community safe. Due to their numbers, I assume that "council officers" will be also able to enforce PSBO's who, unlike police officers do not have conflict management experience and training. Can they even demand a name and address to issue an FPN? The effective implementation of a PSPO must continue to be part of a broader approach that includes several different initiatives to tackle the problems i.e., preventing both reducing the likelihood of it occurring and reduces the potential impact. I am a firm believer in education and communication to prevent the activity, e.g. short presentations at schools, colleges, and communities to spread understanding of the issue and continued messages in the media etc. This type of behaviour is always about changing behaviour of the public, enforcement should be the last resort.</p>
<p>The proposed PSPO No 2 should also include cattle, sheep, and pigs - all livestock roaming the forest. AND: probably warrants a separate PSPO: all pet dogs on the forest should be kept on leads at all times to avoid disturbance of livestock and local flora and fauna.</p>
<p>The Protection Order should cover ALL livestock within the proposed area not just horses, donkeys and mules.</p>
<p>The PSPO should be widened to include cattle and pigs.</p>
<p>The removal of livestock would change the whole character and ecology of the New Forest. It has been common land for millennia with livestock able to range freely. The commoning way of life and culture would disappear for ever and the area would be overgrown as has been seen in other enclosed but un-grazed commons in the country. It is internationally important as grazed woodlands and must not be lost. This order is needed to help ensure that it survives - the public must not be allowed 'to love it to death'. It is not a playground. It should have been made a national nature reserve rather than national park as it gives the wrong impression to visitors.</p>
<p>The signs are around telling people the rules not to feed or touch the livestock but they still do it. We need more policing by the forest authorities otherwise PSPO no 2 will have little effect I fear.</p>
<p>The sooner the better - save these animals' lives!</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

The various animals have a very positive impact on the Forest both ecologically and aesthetically and need to be protected from any thoughtless members of the public, and thus protect the safety of both the animals and that section of the public.

strongly support the introduction of this order.

The wording includes for potential enforcement by an 'authorised officer'. I think there should be clarity on who is this and how is he/she is recognised. Also, if there is no officer present, a similar clarity on how he/she is to be contacted.

The wording is too strong and whilst feeding of animals should be stopped. The petting of animals will not turn them into nasty animals so the second part should read "and feeding" so the action of petting and feeding is stopped. Just petting sends a message that the New Forest breed is dangerous and it is not.

There always used to be 'Feeding of animals prohibited' signs, with the threat of a fine (£50?). It is imperative that visitors to the Forest do not treat the livestock as pets or a method to dispose of surplus apples etc, and I cannot fathom why they are so resistant to learning this. Cattle should also be included on the list of animals not to be petted or fed. Just a couple of weeks ago I had to tell some people (who had been camping overnight in a Forest car park) to stop throwing carrots towards some cows with their calves to entice them nearer for a photograph.

There are more serious matters that need to be addressed: dogs off leads and dog waste litter, on road (not off-road) cycling events, drones. I dislike the fact that there are so many penalty notices being issued now and that people risk being penalised for so many activities. The ability to legally challenge FPNs is also rather vague. Enforcement will be impossible (and unfair) without numerous clear signs that warn not only of the prohibitions but also make it clear that offenders will be penalised. These signs will be needed in every car park, every layby and on every road entering the area. Who will enforce the rules? There will not be any extra police officers. Forest rangers or other NPA employees will require additional training in handling conflict, use of discretion, enforcement procedures, evidence gathering and court procedures. Police are meant to practice the Four Es "engage, explain, encourage, enforce". The issue of penalty notices should be the last resort for more minor events. Unfortunately even among those who are highly trained in law enforcement there are some who are overzealous. I have seen people feeding crisps or other snacks to ponies on only three or four occasions over many years. This has been in car parks on Stoney Cross and in the layby on the Burley Road near Picket Post. I have never seen anyone feeding donkeys despite the large gatherings of donkeys near some of the local pubs. Many of the donkeys will approach walkers but I believe this is because they are inherently friendly and in some cases have been treated as pets by their owners (unlike most of the ponies). Donkey foals are very playful and will often approach and bang against your legs or butt you. This is a case of the animal touching the human rather than the other way round. I have often seen large amounts of carrots and other veg thrown onto the ground. I have always assumed that this was done by the commoners as a food supplement during the winter. There is nothing inherently unhealthy about carrots for horses. If it is not done by the commoners then I accept that it should not be encouraged on the basis that no one should be feeding animals that do not belong to them. The draft specifies the feeding of ponies, donkeys and mules. It is possible that someone throwing food out onto the ground could maintain that they are feeding cattle, sheep or pigs rather than equines. There are people who put food out for wildlife, including badgers, foxes and deer. Those of us who live locally sometimes forgot how unique and special the forest is. One of the issues is that many visitors to the forest have no experience of seeing livestock roaming free. Some do not understand that the ponies are effectively wild. Others do not understand that they are actually owned by the commoners. Many people in their own area think it is okay to feed a snack to a horse over the field gate. Patting friendly horses is a common activity, sometimes encouraged by owners. There are already signs indicating that it is not allowed but criminalising these feeding and touching activities seems very heavy handed. I believe that where people are seen to be feeding animals they should be challenged and given appropriate advice. I would expect this to be done by the police, forest employees and the commoners but they are few and far between. I have seen this behaviour challenged by other members of the public. There are legal options available to deal with people who throw food on the ground (litter laws). There are also options such as injunctions for animal owners to use against people who repeatedly feed their animals without permission. Overall I believe that the issue of criminal penalties for these activities is over the top and that anyone seen feeding or deliberately touching animals should be dealt with by way of advice. To suggest that the animals will be taken off the rest if this legislation is not passed is absolutely ridiculous. It is presumably thrown in as a form of scaremongering to encourage people to support the order. There may be occasions when an individual cow or pony should be taken off but there is no reason at all to suggest that the future of commoning should be at risk.

There is ample signage explaining that you should not pet or feed these animals but no one seems to take any notice of them, it goes on all the time. However, if a PSPO were implemented the penalties for the offence should be made clear.

There is no place for donkeys in the Forest. They were never part of the animal population that shaped the New Forest. Kids think they are cute. If you want to stop people petting animals then get rid of the donkeys. Also there are way too many animals. there were around 3500 animals. Now there is in excess of 10,000. Livestock will disturb nesting birds and eat eggs like lapwings and curlews for the general nutrition and calcium.

There need to be some exceptions. I have had on several occasions removed gorse from ponies manes over the years. I only ever intervene if the gorse/stick poses a threat to the ponies eye sight and if the animal is calm enough to approach safely. I have seen others do the same, usually locals. I don't live in the forest but still consider it local because I've been coming to the forest for years. I realise it could be difficult to insert an exception clause but there is a clear difference between petting an animal and touching it in order to help it. I am aware that you can notify verderers to help but that's only 9-5 on week days. Sometimes if it's safe it's alot quicker just to help the animal to prevent an injury than it is to call for help by which time the pony has disappeared or worse suffered an irreversible eye injury.

There needs to be actual permanent signs mentioning the fines as there were in my childhood, particularly in areas where large numbers of tourist gather. People do not look on the NPA website and remember or pay attention to warnings there.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>There should be good notices at access points to educate people of these concerns.</p>
<p>There was no question in this survey about the impact of feeding on the animals themselves and the commoners they belong to. People need to understand that these animals do belong to someone, they don't need and shouldn't have additional food, and that commoning is what makes the forest as it is, so needs to be supported and not threatened by their actions.</p>
<p>Think is should be permanent ban, also on all paperwork given out to visitors to the area as well as local news so that people are in no doubt that it should not be done. Also education in schools and colleges. I think the fine should also be higher.</p>
<p>This banning of everything is getting out of hand. What sort of country do we want to live in? I agree there should be advisory rules to discourage people from touching or feeding the animal but to introduce fines is excessive, draconian and almost impossible to enforce.</p>
<p>THIS COMMENT MIRRORS MY COMMENT ON PSPO No1 - as my views are more about the use of PSPOs than the particular proposed applications. I have voted NO to the use of the PSPO because I do not believe that PSPOs are either the correct or suitable legal solution. Moreover, I think they represent a very shoddy tool in the legal toolbox and the literature highlights a host of poor practice to support that view. As councillors will be aware, the power to make PSPOs stems from legislation in 2014 to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour. It was designed to tackle activities occurring in public places which were deemed to have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality. In itself, that is already an unusually subjective aim for any form of enforcement. Commentators at the time referred to the "unprecedented breadth of the new powers which in effect "allowed councils to create crimes". The lack of clarity around what qualifies as having a detrimental effect on quality of life opens up the undesirable prospect of including things simply on the basis of taste and yet still criminalising such behaviour. None of this sounds like good practice to me. In the early years, initial uses appeared to remain close to the assumed ASB-tackling intent. Typical applications were associated with nuisances from noise, alcohol or substance use, dogs and intimidating activity such as aggressive begging and nearly always in an urban setting. Over time, however, a degree of scope creep has seen PSPOs used for ever wider purposes often being used as a quick fix means to avoid using or amending existing proper legal process (eg formally sanctioned byelaws) which could and should have be used to deal with anything that is considered criminal activity. This trend has been encouraged by weak (or non-existent) oversight by the Home Office leading to various high profile cases of inappropriate application. In the worst cases, councils stand accused of outsourcing policing by authorising private security contractors to issue on the spot fines, followed by prosecution in a magistrates court for something that isn't a crime (under criminal law) even in cases where it is only determined that a contravention may have occurred (not where one has definitely taken place). Is that really a public space model that we want to participate in? I would ask that councillors consider very carefully whether this rather murky legal area is really a road they want to go down and, if it is, whether they fully understand and are prepared for the minefield of application, interpretation and lobbying that is likely to follow. If forest problems need tackling, let's use (or fix) the correct legal mechanisms rather than shoehorn the aims into a piece of ill-conceived and poorly implemented pseudo-law that, in any event, was always aimed at a rather different set of circumstances than we are facing.</p>
<p>This does not go nearly far enough. There is a major issue with walking of dogs off lead in the New Forest NPA , especially the National Trust Commons , causing huge disturbance to ground nesting birds eg the skylark , meadow pipit , woodlark , the curlew and snipe ; it is no use telling owners to keep dogs under control - THEY MUST BE TOLD TO KEEP THEM ON THE LEAD IN THE NESTING SEASON. I want to hear the singing of the birds from the main tracks , especially the skylark, curlew, drumming of the snipe , the curlew and Dartford Warbler but there are so many dogs around the Commons. Riding of horses must be restricted to designated tracks ; horses cannot be ridden through valley mires at any time of the year. Increased fines must be imposed for dropping of litter and parking on verges.</p>
<p>This has been a problem for far too long and needs addressing immediately to stop members of the public feeding and petting them</p>
<p>This is a continuing problem - we need to enforce this message to prevent harm to the livestock which are so important to the ecology and landscape of the New Forest</p>
<p>This is a long time coming. In my opinion should be supported by the reinstating of the huge signs at every entrance to the area clearly stating what is and is not acceptable behaviour. As worked so well in the past.</p>
<p>This is a long time in coming - should have happened sooner !</p>
<p>This is a ridiculous idea. To think of fining a child for offering an apple core to a donkey or pony is beyond belief. They are semi-wild animals, have been used to people around the forest petting and offering them odd bits of fruit for hundreds of years. The council would be better served by monitoring the dangerous speeding vehicles which go much too fast along the narrow forest roads endangering these animals. Speed cameras and police patrols, particularly siting average speed cameras on the entrance and exit routes to the forest would be a far better use of council resources than trying to stop children from interacting with forest animals.</p>
<p>This is a step too far</p>
<p>This is a waste of time and money. There isn't anyone to enforce it so, apart from one or two high publicity events, catching anyone in the act is nearly zero. The animals have been encouraged near roads by extra feeding by the owners and by managing the land near roads to provide grazing. Reducing animal numbers and relocating them to lower footfall areas. At the moment there are high stock numbers in areas that put them in direct confrontation with people/roads. Further away from those areas stock numbers are much lower. This is another attempt to reduce the public from visiting.</p>
<p>This is long overdue and gives everyone who cares about the ponies donkeys and forest some support to point out to visitors that it is not appropriate to feed the animals.</p>
<p>This is long overdue, much needed and I fully support it.</p>



Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

<p>This is much needed. If someone gets attacked by an animal they won't for one minute believe it's their fault. Council are partly at fault for letting it go on for so long. I'm sorry to say.</p>
<p>This is nothing new. Decades ago there were road signs (black horse on white background with a penalty amount £25 for feeding them) around the Forest. In fact one was several hundred yards from Appletree court entrance on the roadside by Boltens Bench, but was removed a while back no doubt by yourselves. There is plenty of evidence that livestock learn that humans give food, just look at the problems with ponies entering tents, and entering shops or hanging around outside like the ice cream shop in Burley, food store at Bramshaw, ice cream vans in Forest car parks. Personally I am not phased by the petting of livestock and think that fines for that is not needed. People have been informed by signage not to do it and if they are injured by the stock then 'too bad'. So in conclusion, if the animals behaviour is changed and influence by mankind then that should be curtailed by fines if that what it takes. If the petting of animals results in personal injury then that is due to the stupidity and lack of common sense by mankind and not the fault of the livestock. I find it difficult to think how you oversee the fining of people feeding stock, particularly if they are operating from a car. You need evidence, and that may be harder to get than said. May be the potential of a fine like those signs of yesteryear should be reinstated.</p>
<p>This is taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut. I have lived in the New Forest for [REDACTED] and in all that time I can only think of a handful of occasions when someone has been injured as a consequence of attempting to pet or feed stock that have been turned out to graze. By all means try to raise public awareness of the inadvisability of petting and feeding semi-feral livestock - but turning this into an offence and then wasting scarce public resources trying to enforce it is completely disproportionate to the scale of the problem.</p>
<p>This matter is far more complex than the barbecue / fire issue. The Forest is marketed as a tourist destination, with the animals, especially the Ponies, a key part of the attraction. Many visitors have no idea that feeding the animals can cause problems. People love animals and see feeding them as 'harmless' and 'kind'. If we don't want people to interact with the animals, then lower the animals profile. I have seen varying behaviour, from the stupid, like feeding ponies from cars in the road, to the innocent, such as kids offering carrots or slices of apple. A sense of perspective is essential. As for removing animals from some areas, why not? It might give new trees and shrubs a chance to grow, enhancing the woodland through regeneration.</p>
<p>This must be passed quickly before matters deteriorate further</p>
<p>This needs to be done to protect the animals without which the forest would not continue as it is which would be criminal. It is not kind to the livestock it is very bad for them and people do not listen to the commoners or read the signs, they are feeding them selfishly, they are seen only as an attraction</p>
<p>This NEEDS to happen to protect all the animals in the forest. Tourists (especially in the summer) feed them so much that they get upset stomachs or are violent and aggressive. They aren't a petting zoo and something needs to change.</p>
<p>This proposal is definitely needed. The Forest is being treated as a petting zoo and attitudes and behaviours have to change.</p>
<p>This PSPO needs to become law, which I believe will help educate people about the dangers of feeding and petting our lovely animals.</p>
<p>This really needs to be policed extensively to work, and not brushed aside as underfunded or a lack of resources.</p>
<p>This should also include interfering with cattle and approaching all livestock especially those with foals and calves. This should also include feeding pigs which is a serious risk for introducing African Swine fever, foot and mouth disease etc. The "feeding of ponies prohibited signs" on the cattle grids should be reinstated</p>
<p>This should apply to the whole of the New Forest and not just restricted areas.</p>
<p>This should be done asap</p>
<p>This should have been done a long time ago. The New Forest is not a petting zoo or a safari park.</p>
<p>This will only have an impact if it is actually enforced.</p>
<p>Throughout the tourist season we see people feeding and petting the ponies. Visitors have no understanding of the danger this represents to animals and also people driving through the forest. It's time the NFPAs powers to try and stop this were increased significantly</p>
<p>To see the livestock being removed from the forest would be devastating to me and many others. The livestock is what makes the forest so special and it is wonderful to see them free roaming in a habitat they help shape.</p>
<p>Tourists and visitors play a key impact in the economy of the new forest, stopping visitors having the photos with horses and donkeys in the common area will stop people visiting. If animals are to be kept away from people move them off the common Forest land.</p>
<p>Tourists will not be immediately deterred from petting the animals by the proposed measures, but they're a start. Maybe the publicity surrounding their introduction will help.</p>
<p>Very good as some visitors appear not to understand that the feeding of animals is not allowed for their own safety</p>
<p>Visitors and even locals can be totally unaware of the dangers to themselves of approaching these animals. If the animals are fed and petted they get use to it and it encourages them on to the road and where people gather which put the animals in danger. The order should be extended to cover pigs as well. These should be more educational boards at the entrances to the New Forest making people aware of the dangers.</p>
<p>Visitors must be aware that this part of the forest is there home and animals have more rights than the visitors - not enough education on the visitors visiting the forest - personally there should be a toll to everyone that uses the Forest</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

Visitors with children come to the new forest to see the animals and if a child cant be allowed to gently pet a pony in the wild that is wrong. Often pony's approach walkers and like some interaction. I suspect this is only the first step of the verderers then moving on to get the public banned from areas of the forest where their pony's are released. The New Forest is a national park and as such should not have increasing restrictions dictated by a very small group of people.
We do not want people to be discouraged from coming to enjoy the Forest and part of the attraction is to see the animals roaming free. However, warning signs and polite requests do not seem to deter some people from acting in a way which is dangerous both for themselves and for the animals. I do wonder, though, how easy it would be to enforce.
We found the wording on question 5 ambiguous and would like to emphasise that if New Forest Ponies, Horses, Donkeys and Mules were removed from the Restricted Area it would detract from the joy of the Forest landscape.
We fully support the PSPO and would like to see planned review. We were also wondering whether it would be appropriate to include other livestock (pigs, cattle) at this time
We have to remember that the wildlife was here way before we were. Whilst I acknowledge that tourism is needed for the local business's all wildlife here should be protected above anything else.
We need better education NOT a police state
We should encourage responsible access for all. It is imperative that efforts to educate the public come first and the PSPO is only used as a last resort. Information to the public both locals and visitors needs to be clear as to why this is needed. Perhaps signage making the public aware of the PSPO could include a QR code leading to a simple explanation of this need. This is especially true for the feeding and petting issue as many may not fully understand the damage they are doing. With regard to question 5 "grazing by commoners" stock is fundamental to the New Forest. Without them we would not have the biodiverse ecosystem, whose importance is recognised by international and national designations. It needs to be clear how this PSPO would apply to private land which forms part of the perambulation, and landowners affected should be aware of it. It needs to be clear what areas are defined as Public Space (see the proposed PSPO - (Public Pack)Agenda Document for Cabinet, 02/11/2022 10:00 (newforest.gov.uk) ) so Authorised Officers can use their powers correctly.
We welcome this initiative, thank you - it needs to be supported by well-placed signage (e.g. outside certain pubs and campsites) and enforcement.
What about cattle.
What happens if animals are in the road and blocking the road completely are we still allowed to get out and move them or are we breaking the law
While I agree that Feeding NF Ponys, Donkeys, Mules should be prohibited. I agree that Ponys should not be petted. I Do Not Agree that Donkeys should not be petted.
Whilst I accept that the feeding and petting of animals is a problem for Commoners it does does not have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality as per Government guidelines because such a small minority are directly affected. My principal concern is not in opposition to this PSPO per se but rather that, if introduced, it establishes a dangerous precedent that PSPOs can be used to criminalise behaviour which only affects a very small minority. Furthermore the Act and Home Office statutory guidance states that the area covered by an Order must be proportionate in the circumstances and restricting activities only where necessary. In this case the proposed order covers almost the entirety of the New Forest - it can hardly be that pony petting and feeding is a problem meeting the "detrimental impact" test across that vast area. If a PSPO is to be introduced it should be limited to 'honey pot' areas where this is a significant problem. Whilst I expect that the vast majority of respondents to this consultation will support it that, in itself, cannot be taken as evidence of widespread detrimental impact due to the self selecting nature and widespread publication on social media strongly supportive of the PSPO.
Whilst out with my dog I Have seen numerous examples of petting & feeding - often right beside signs requesting the public not to do this! Of course it should be stopped as it puts the animals at risk & can make them relinquish natural grazing in favour of waiting for food from other sources. The animals are an integral part of the forest and its ecology, and inappropriate/misguided public behaviour should not be allowed to dictate the animals' continued access. The problem will surely be, how to ensure compliance from the public?
Who will be able to enforce the PSPO No. 2? Will there be sufficient personnel to carry this out.
Who will have the authority to impose the PSPO? If approached why would a person give their details to enable the PSPO to be imposed and the fine given? Can the fines be advertised in the local paper so that others can see that NFDC mean business? I feel very strongly about this item [REDACTED] I can see the difference in animal behavior and human behavior and it can be very dangerous to pet an untrained animal. I have seen people put their children on the backs of ponies at Bolton's Bench - I wonder would they walk into a lion's den and do the same thing? The New Forest is NOT advertised as a petting zoo!
Whole heartedly agree that feeding Forest livestock should be stopped by well meaning individuals. These animals are..at the end of the day.. not theirs to feed, leave many ill...injured..even dead. Very distressing for the owners.
Why have you coupled the two points together? The feeding of ponies is wrong, the petting of ponies is generally harmless. To be fined Â£1k for an innocent pat really would be quite ridiculous. I can see how feeding them should be discouraged. There seems to have been an explosion in the number of particularly donkeys in recent years, as a resident of [REDACTED] to this area I have rarely seen petting being an issue. It generally happens very infrequently in any case. It seems somewhat absurd that this would need a deterrent.
Why is there no proposed PSPO for dogs to be under appropriate control at all times? (Stock chasing/worrying and disturbance to ground-nesting birds during the breeding season, being just two examples)
Why would it not include cattle and pigs?

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 2?

With the huge number of visitors the N.F. now attracts it is unrealistic to expect the vast majority to understand equine behaviour and risk. I feel it is much fairer and safer to protect both these wonderful ponies and visitors by making it clear it is an offence to feed them.
Withdrawing browsing animals from the Forest would be absolutely catastrophic for the biodiversity and beauty of the Forest. Its fundamental character would be destroyed and the unique landscape would be greatly diminished. There is no other comparable habitat in terms of biodiversity and scale in Europe. The current system of depastured animals freely roaming across the woods and heaths must be preserved at all costs.
Without the Commoner's livestock the New Forest would not exist. They must be protected at all costs. The general public must also be protected... from their own foolhardy actions !
supports the PSPO2 which would give greater powers regarding the protection of livestock in the New Forest.
Would enforcement of these proposals be increased ? At the present time there does not seem to be enough staff on "the ground " to control the situation.
Yes, it should also include Pannage season - pigs. I have seen people feeding whole packets of cheap sliced white bread to pannage pigs. Pigs should be added and also, maybe cattle and sheep too.
Yes, the wording needs to be changed to all lawfully depastured animals (ponies, donkeys, cattle, pigs and sheep) and remove the term New Forest ponies
Yes. The attention that visitors give to the animals by feeding or petting draws them to the roads
YES-its flawed! Very Flawed! let me tell you a story-just after covid at about was getting on horse at Ashley Walk-there was a young couple with a child (about 5am) there was a calf and close by a cow (mother!) then saw the young couple with their camera-getting the girl to stand by the calf and try to stroke it-called out to them to back off-went over and explained that the mother may well attack them-they listened-this time. This should be for all free roaming stock on the forest-cattle, pigs. sheep and all equines.
You are going to need a lot of personnel to enforce the rules?
You can introduce any PCSO you want, but you will not be able to enforce them. You do not have the resources?
You can't police the current Bye-Laws (verge parking, drone flying etc) so you have no chance of policing this proposal
You haven't defined the offence to the level required in court. If I push away a pony who is attempting to take my sandwich I technically break your order. If I move the sandwich away from one pony and a second eats it, I've broken your order. What's the difference between, I've dropped an apple and a pony eats it before I pick it up or; I drop an apple to feed a pony? Does your agent have any legal rights to search possible offenders to prove this offence or even to detain them to discuss it? Have you spoken to any agency who understands how these work before writing the draft because it needs to be rewritten. What are your agents going to do when they get the response " no I didn't" " no I'm not going to" " no you can't see what's in my bag"
You shouldn't feed anyone else's property
You state that it has been well communicated the dangers to petting/feeding animals in the NF, this is far from accurate. Commoners ranting on FB groups and accusing everyone who is not a part of their clique or is a local of not understanding/caring etc has driven a divide. I have lived in the NF my whole life and I cannot tell you the last time I saw anything educational outside of the immediate area (i.e to visitors) even within the NF it is limited. Rather than resorting to fines spend more building a sense of community and engagement with both locals and visitors educating them. The commoners have a lot to answer for over recent years with their vitriol on public sites.
Your campaign to discourage feeding needs to have more impact, better signs that are more formal, clear and precise and demonstrate the negative effects of petting.